THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA RECORD

NOVEMBER, 1918
NUMBER 160

9C Ap '19

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

FACULTY COMMITTEE ON EXTENSION

LOUIS R. WILSON, M. C. S. NOBLE, COLLIER COBB, E. C. BRANSON
H. W. CHASE, L. A. WILLIAMS, E. R. RANKIN, A. H. PATTERSON
N. W. WALKER, M. H. STACY, C. L. RAPER, EDWIN GREENLAW
J. H. HANFORD

RALEIGH
EDWARDS & BROUGHTON PRINTING CO.
1918

The Bureau of Extension of the University of North Carolina

The University of North Carolina through its Bureau of Extension offers to the people of the State:

I. General Information:
Concerning books, readings, essays, study outlines, and subjects of general interest. Literature will be loaned from the Library upon the payment of transportation charges each way.

II. Instruction by Lectures:
Lectures of a popular or a technical nature and addresses for commencement or other special occasions will be furnished any community which will pay the traveling expenses of the lecturer.

III. Correspondence Courses:
For teachers in Algebra, Arithmetic, Civics, Drawing, Economics, Education, Engineering, English, European History, French, Geology, German, Greek, Latin, North Carolina History, Rural Economics, Solid Geometry, and United States History.

IV. Guidance in Debate and Declamation:
Through the High School Debating Union, special bulletins and handbooks, and material loaned from the Library.

V. County Economic and Social Surveys:
For use by counties in their effort to improve their economic and social condition.

VI. Municipal and Legislative Reference Aids:
For use in studying and drafting municipal and State legislation.

VII. Educational Information and Assistance:
For teachers, principals, superintendents, school committees and boards. The School of Education acts as a clearing house for information concerning all phases of educational work and conducts a teacher's bureau as an aid to communities and schools in securing efficient teachers.

VIII. Information Concerning the War and After:
Making clear the aims, purposes, and ideals of America in the war and the new era of peace.

For full information, address

THE BUREAU OF EXTENSION,
Chapel Hill, N. C.

The High School Debating Union

History and Purpose

The High School Debating Union was organized among the secondary and high schools of North Carolina by the Dialectic and Philanthropic Literary Societies of the University during the school year 1912-1913. It was organized to encourage debating in a definite, systematic fashion among North Carolina high school students. The query of that year was, RESOLVED, *That the Constitution of North Carolina should be so amended as to allow women to vote under the same qualifications as men.* Ninety schools took part in this state-wide debate on February 22, 1913. Sixteen schools won both debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill for the Final Contest. The Pleasant Garden High School of Guilford County, represented by Messrs. Grady Bowman and S. C. Hodgin, was the winner in the Final Contest, on March 7th, and accordingly was awarded the Aycock Memorial Cup.

A Part of Extension Work

During the school year of 1913-1914 the High School Debating Union moved onward with splendid success. It received the additional support of the Bureau of Extension of the University, in order to insure its permanence and enlarge its usefulness and scope. Everywhere, all over the State, it was recognized as a definite, big part of the University's effort to bring itself into a helpful relation with every community and every person in North Carolina. One hundred and fifty schools enrolled in the Union and took part in the triangular debates on March 20, 1914. Forty-one schools won both of their debates and sent their teams, numbering 164 debaters, to Chapel Hill to compete in the Final Contest. Before an audience of 2,000 in Memorial Hall, on April 3d, the Winston-Salem High School, represented by Messrs. Charles Roddick and Clifton Eaton, won the Final Contest and was awarded the Aycock Memorial Cup. The query was, RESOLVED, *That the Constitution of North Carolina should be so amended as to allow the Initiative and Referendum in State-wide legislation.*

The Contest of 1914-1915

The contest of 1914-1915 was the most successful which had yet been held. Two hundred and fifty schools in 90 counties became members of the Union. Representing them, 1,000 student-debaters spoke, March 26th, before large audiences in cities, towns, and rural communities all

over North Carolina, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt the policy of subsidizing its Merchant Marine engaged in foreign trade.* Fifty schools won both debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill to compete in the Final Contest. Before another splendid audience in Memorial Hall, on April 9th, the Wilson High School, represented by Misses Lalla Rookh Fleming and Ethel Gardner, won and was awarded the Aycock Memorial Cup.

The Contest of 1915-1916

Three hundred and twenty-five schools represented by 1,300 debaters enrolled in the Union during the fall of 1915 for a great state-wide debate March 31, 1916, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt the policy of greatly enlarging its Navy.* Sixty-eight schools won both debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill to compete in the Final Contest. The Aycock Memorial Cup was won, on April 14th, by Miss Myrtle Cooper and Boyd Harden of the Graham High School. Five hundred visitors came to Chapel Hill for the Final Contest of the Debating Union and the other features of High School Week.

The Contest of 1916-1917

The query which was discussed in the fifth annual contest of the High School Debating Union was, RESOLVED, *That the Federal Government should own and operate the railways.* The state-wide contest on March 31, 1917, was participated in by 1,324 student-debaters, representing 331 schools. Seventy-four schools won both debates and sent their representatives to Chapel Hill to compete in the Final Contest. Messrs. Vinson Smathers and Roy Francis of the Waynesville High School were victorious from the total number of 296 debaters present, and were awarded the Aycock Memorial Cup, the final debate being held in Memorial Hall before an audience which taxed to the utmost the hall's capacity. The number of visitors coming to the University for the exercises of High School Week was six hundred.

The Contest for 1917-1918

The sixth contest centered around the query: RESOLVED, *That Congress should enact a law providing for the compulsory arbitration of industrial disputes.* The finals were held at Chapel Hill on April 11th and 12th, when 66 teams with 264 debaters participated. This was probably one of the most spirited and hotly contested debates ever held on the Hill. From first to last the good sportsmanship of every one was a matter of most favorable comment. Thomas Burton and Will Anderson, representing the Wilson High School, won the decision and carried the Aycock Memorial Cup back to Wilson for the second time, Wilson having won the 1915 contest.

The Query for 1918-1919

This year the contestants will discuss the query, Resolved, *That the United States Government should adopt a policy requiring one year of military training of all able-bodied men before they reach the age of 21.* It is vitally necessary that we as a nation consider well the need, the advisability, and the drift of compulsory military training in our democracy. The question vitally affects every boy not yet 21 years of age now in school as well as every boy below 21 not in school. It affects every industry and occupation of our entire people as greatly perhaps in our foreign as in our domestic relations. The answer is not ready-made and we must take our part in helping to work it out.

Membership of the Union

Every secondary and high school in North Carolina is invited to become a member of the Union and participate in this state-wide debate. Every school that enters will, as usual, be grouped with two others in a triangle, each school putting out two teams, one on the affirmative and the other on the negative. Every school which wins both of its debates in the first preliminary will be grouped with two other winning schools for a second preliminary. Every school which wins both of its debates in this second preliminary will be entitled to send its teams to Chapel Hill to contest for the State Championship and the Aycock Memorial Cup. Members of such teams as represent their schools at Chapel Hill will be presented with bronze medals appropriately inscribed. The first preliminaries will be held early in March; the second preliminaries will be held about one month later. The final contests will be held at Chapel Hill as soon after the second preliminaries as it is possible to arrange for them.

Regulations

1. The Dialectic and Philanthropic Literary Societies of the University of North Carolina will suggest a query, to be discussed on a given date by schools entering the Union.

2. All secondary schools of North Carolina, however supported, offering regularly organized courses of study above the seventh grade, and not extending in their scope and content beyond a standard four-year high school course as defined by the State Department of Education, shall be eligible for membership in the Debating Union.

3. All schools accepting this offer and thus becoming members of the Union shall be arranged into groups of three for the first preliminary debate, the status and standards of the schools, their proximity, accessibility, and convenience of location to be considered in forming the groups.

4. Each school of each group shall agree to furnish two debating teams of two members each, the one to uphold the affirmative side of the query, and the other to defend the negative side.

5. The members of the debating teams must all be bona fide students of the school which they represent. A bona fide student is one in attendance at the time of the debate, and who has been in attendance for at least 30 per cent of the school year up to and including the date of the debate, and who has made passing grades on a majority of his work.

6. The team debating at home shall in each case uphold the affirmative side of the query, and the visiting team the negative.

7. The schools themselves shall select and agree upon the judges of the local contests. The decision rendered by the judges shall be final and not subject to review. All schools are expected to follow the accompanying suggestions as to judges.

8. Each speaker shall have twenty (20) minutes at his disposal, not more than fifteen (15) of which shall be used in the first speech.

9. Any school which shall win both of its debates in the first preliminary shall be placed in a second preliminary with two other winning schools. This second preliminary shall be conducted in accord with the regulations for the first preliminary.

10. Each school which shall win both of its debates in the second preliminary shall be entitled to send both to the University for the final contests.

11. All contestants are expected to prepare their own speeches with legitimate assistance of the teachers, principals, or superintendents in their school system. *Legitimate assistance* is interpreted to mean *oral* advice, suggestions, discussion, and criticism.

12. In the event that one school in either the first or second preliminary drops out and the committee at Chapel Hill is unable to secure a school to take its place, then the two teams remaining shall debate one another, each sending a team on the negative to the other. The school winning both debates in either first or second preliminary shall be eligible to enter the next contest.

13. In the event that two schools in either the first or second preliminary drop out and the committee at Chapel Hill is unable to secure schools to take their places, then the remaining school shall be declared winner over the others by their default and shall be eligible to enter the next contest.

14. In the semi-finals at the University a team on the affirmative shall debate a team on the negative, each team having the privilege of a rejoinder, as in the preliminaries.

15. All contestants who as winners in the second preliminary shall represent their school at Chapel Hill shall be presented with a bronze medal appropriately inscribed.

16. The school having the strongest team on the affirmative side of the query and the school having the strongest team on the negative side, as determined by the semi-finals at Chapel Hill, shall be entitled to contest publicly in the University Chapel for the Aycock Memorial Cup.

17. The school which shall win this final debate shall have its name inscribed on the Memorial Cup, together with the names of its two winning representatives.

18. Any school which shall win in the final contest for two years in succession shall have the cup for its own property.

19. All high school representatives and principals coming to the University for this contest will be met at the station by a committee and will be entertained free of cost while at Chapel Hill.

Suggestions as to Judges

1. The judges should be disinterested parties to the success of either team, and, so far as possible, should be non-local.

2. They should sit apart during the debate.

3. They should judge the contest *as a debate*, and at its conclusion without consultation should vote "Affirmative" or "Negative" on the merits of the *debate*. They should not consider the merits of the question.

4. Each judge should sign and seal his vote and deliver it, through an usher, to the presiding officer who should publicly open the votes and announce the decision.

5. Before the debate begins a copy of these suggestions should be given to each judge for his guidance.

Originality of Debates

The High School Conference in session at Chapel Hill during the summer of 1916 recommended, "That the principals of the schools in the various triangles be urged to take some steps among themselves looking toward the originality of the debates." The committee realizes that "The debate which a speaker produces should be his very best; but it should under no circumstances be better than his best"; that the success of the Union will be seriously hindered unless in each instance the speech of a debater represents his own individual work. It wishes, therefore, to ask the principals to give this matter their careful consideration and to note particularly Regulation No. 11. In cases where necessary, the principals in the various triangles should take such action among themselves as they deem necessary.

Enter Your School Now

The High School Debating Union is essentially an organization for the secondary and high schools of the State. That it possesses unlimited possibilities for usefulness to every high school and teacher and to every community in the State goes without saying. Its success, however, and its benefits to those concerned are dependent upon the support accorded it by the students and school men of North Carolina. If your school has not yet enrolled, in order that its possibilities for usefulness to you may be realized, see to it that your school—the school of which you are principal, or the school which you attend, or the school in your community—enrolls immediately in the Union.

This bulletin has been prepared by Dr. L. A. Williams, Professor of School Administration in the University, who, during my absence in military service, generously carried on the work of the Union.

For fuller information, address

E. R. RANKIN, *Secretary*,
HIGH SCHOOL DEBATING UNION,
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Universal Military Training

Query

RESOLVED, *That the Government of the United States should adopt a policy of requiring one year of military training of all able-bodied men before they reach the age of 21.*

Explanation and Limitation

That the issue may be clear and the procedure uniform in the debates the following explanation and limitations of the query are expressly laid down:

1. The query involves a matter of national policy. The method by which the policy would be administered does not enter into the argument. If such a policy were adopted the Government might, for example, decide to administer the law through the medium of the schools. Whether or not this is or would be desirable is a different query and does not enter into the present discussion.
2. It is understood that the expense involved in the execution of such a policy would be borne by the United States Government.
3. The term "able-bodied" is understood to mean all men who are physically fit to serve in the army.
4. The term "military training" is agreed to include training in any branch of our military work, whether in the army, the navy, or the aviation corps.
5. It is agreed that "compulsory military training" implies "compulsory military service"; the one meaning the imposition of legal obligation by law, to submit to military instruction for the stated period; the other meaning the legal obligation to be called upon to join the military establishment when the nation is actually at war.

Statistical Comparison of Universal and Voluntary Military Service

(Prepared by the Army War College, Washington)

The leading European powers, and Japan, are organized for industrial competition in peace and for full preparedness against war. England and the United States are not so organized.

The principal "tool" used by the European nations and by Japan in such organization has been universal military service, an institution extending back into the last century, adopted and made compulsory by vote of their peoples; and with time so adjusted, developed, and corrected as to coördinate with the industrial, commercial, and financial life of the nation, and make the transition from peace to war conditions least disturbing to the nation.

By means of this tool, we find, early in 1914, that the war man power of the universal service nations is limited by their respective financial conditions, by the material which is disposable for war, and by the numbers of able-bodied male citizens who can be taken from those interior industries and vocations that are essential to the continuance of the national life and to the prosecution of war; and we find further that some of those nations can place in the field one-tenth of their total population, organized, armed, and equipped, trained and physically fit for actual fighting.

On the other hand we find, at this time, the two English-speaking nations whose geographical situation, populations, and resources place them in the front rank of world powers, pursuing parallel policies in avoiding any semblance of military strength on land, seeking rather to confine their preparedness to power on the sea; and hoping when attacked to find defense on land through volunteers, supplemented in great stress by conscripts.

The world military situation existing today and created by universal service, by which the principal European nations and Japan are able to place the trained masses of their peoples in the fighting fronts, is ominous, and it makes pertinent a comparison of the universal and voluntary service systems. With the object of giving a concise statistical view of the situation, the accompanying tables have been prepared, based upon data found in the "Statesman's Year Book, 1915," most of the items pertaining to conditions existing prior to the present European war.

TABLE I—*Universal Service—Liability and Enrollment.*

Nation	Liability		Actual Enrollment for Service							
	Ages from, to—	Total Years of	Service begins (age)	First Period		Second Period		Third Period		Total Years Enrolled
				Years Enrolled	Years Training	Years Enrolled	Months Training	Years Enrolled	Months Training	
Universal-service nations:										
Austria-Hungary	19–42	24	21	12	2¼	9	------	------	------	21
France	20–48	29	20	14	3⅙	7	½	7	------	28
Germany	17–45	29	20	7	2⅙	12	1	6	------	25
Italy	20–38	19	20	8	2	4	------	7	------	19
Japan	17–40	24	20	7⅓	2⅓	10	4	2⅔	------	20
Russia	20–43	24	20	18	3¼	5	------	------	------	23
Limited compulsory-service nations:										
Australia	19–26	8	19	8	½	------	------	------	------	8
Switzerland	17–48	32	20	12	5/12	8	⅓	8	------	28
Voluntary-service nations:										
United Kingdom	18–45	28	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
United States	18–45	28	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Analysis of Table I

While some of the universal service nations hold their young men to *liability* for service prior to the age of 20 years, and their older men after the age of 38 years, they do not, as a rule, enroll men *for training* before the twentieth nor after the thirty-eighth year. This may be explained by the fact of many immature youths of less than 20, and to marked depreciation in fitness after 38.

Generally, therefore, we find that training, and actual service as soldiers, begins at the age of 20 and extends through three periods of relative fitness, with average about as follows:

(*a*) A first line period, consisting of two or three years of intensive training, followed by seven or eight years of first reserve service, the latter with some training. During this period, physical fitness is considered at the maximum, i. e., from 20 to 30 years.

(*b*) A second line period, consisting of about 10 years of second reserve service, with short periods of supplementary training, generally at maneuvers.

(*c*) A home defense or auxiliary service period, generally without any training, for men between 40 and 45 years.

Included in this table will be found corresponding figures pertaining to Australia and Switzerland, states which have adopted limited compulsory service for home defense only, the results of which have not been tested by war.

TABLE II—*Universal Service—Population, Finance, Man Power.*

Nation	Population	Finance				Man Power					
						Theoretical		Actual			
		Total Yearly Budget Estimates	Yearly Cost of Training			Males 18 to 45 Fit for Service	Total Males Actually Available and Fully Fit for Fighting	System of Training	Peace Establishment	Total Trained, Organized, Armed, Equipped, and Fit for Actual Fighting	Yearly Unit Cost
			Army Budget Estimates	Per Cent of Total Budget	Unit Cost Per Inhabitant						
Austria-Hungary	54,000,000	$1,216,000,000	$151,000,000	12	$ 2.80	9,000,000	5,400,000	Universal	425,000	3,000,000	$ 50.33
France	40,000,000	1,012,000,000	200,000,000	20	5.00	6.700,000	4,000,000	do	845,000	4,000,000	50.00
Germany	67,000,000	852,000,000	252,000,000	25	3.16	11,000,000	6,700,000	do	805,000	6,700,000	31.64
Italy	36,000,000	557,000,000	91,000,000	16	2.53	6 000.000	3 600,000	do	305,000	1,600,000	56.87
Japan	54,000,000	273,000,000	49,000,000	18	.91	9,000 000	5 400,000	do	400,000	2,000,000	24.50
Russia	174,000,000	1,843,000,000	381,000,000	21	2.19	29,000,000	17,400,000	do	1,300,000	7,000,000	54.43
Australia	5,000,000	177,000,000	15,000,000	9	3.00	800,000	500 000	Limited, compulsory	120,000	200,000	75.00
Switzerland	4,000,000	19,000,000	9,000,000	5	2.25	670,000	400,000	do	150,000	400,000	22 50
United Kingdom	46,000,000	973,000,000	141,000,000	15	3.07	8,000,000	4,600,000	Voluntary	165,000	350,000	402.86
United States	100,000,000	*720,000,000	†102,000,000	14	1.02	17,000,000	10,000,000	do	110,000	200,000	510.00

*Ordinary expenditures and excluding postal-service expenditures paid from postal revenues.
†Eliminating bounties and pensions.

Analysis of Table II

That the figures in this table may be understood, it must be borne in mind that not only do financial, industrial, and economic conditions, varying in the different nations, seriously affect the cost of military efficiency, but also that in some nations utilities owned by the Government are made use of in military training without corresponding charge against the military budget.

It must be evident that under equal financial and industrial conditions, mobilization for training will cost more in an extensive country like Russia than in a compact country like Italy or Japan.

And, further, it is admitted that a comparative analysis may be misleading, but not vitally so, for the reason that we cannot ascertain what proportion of the budgets is expended for training proper and what proportion is spent for armament, munitions, and other utilities necessary for the prevention or the prosecution of war.

With reference to man power, it appears that the total number of males of military age in a nation fit for service is about one-sixth of the total population. All, however, are not equally fit for service in the fighting line, and a large proportion could be used only for service of the interior. In addition many exemptions must be made, owing to the inadvisability of withdrawing men from those industries and vocations that are essential to the life of the nation, and that proceed in many cases with acceleration during war.

For these and other reasons the proportion of one-sixth that are fit for service dwindles to about one-tenth, and this is the proportion that experience shows as representing the maximum man power which any nation, however farsighted or methodical its statesmen, has been able to place in the fighting fronts or actual operations at the outbreak of war.

In attempting to prepare a trustworthy comparative estimate of the actual man power of the principal nations in terms of men fully trained, organized, armed, equipped, and fit for actual fighting it has been found that most nations hold secret much of the information required. Therefore estimates must rest upon a comparison of various factors that are known, the principal ones being as follows:

(*a*) The extent and effectiveness of the peace training system and the length of time the system has been in operation:

In a nation where a thorough system of universal training has been long established, where the extent and effectiveness of training is properly coördinated with financial conditions, and where the training system has through experience been so corrected and adjusted that it minimizes interference with, while taking full advantage of, industrial, educational, and other features essential to the national life, we are justified in the conclusion that a full maximum of man power can be developed.

On the other hand, a nation that stints or maladministers its training system, or that has not long applied such a system, must suffer a material reduction in a comparative statement of its trained man power.

(*b*) Limitations of organization, armament, equipment, and mobilization. These essentials to preparedness cannot, like mushrooms, spring up during the night. A nation with an available man power of ten millions, but which limits the total of its organizations ready for war to but one-half of that number, must be estimated as having but five millions of man power.

Similarly, reductions must be made to correspond to what a nation actually has in armament, munitions, and equipment.

And if details of mobilization are not worked out by peace practice, defective results will be expected in the placing of men and materials at the fighting fronts at the outbreak of war. There will then be a corresponding decrease in the effective man power.

(*c*) Proportionate exemption of those that are unfit, unworthy, or of those that are fit but cannot be spared from the industries or vocations essential to national life and to the prosecution of war. And to this must be added the elimination of those no longer fit for actual fighting. These exemptions and eliminations, with a nation aiming at the development of its maximum man power, result in a man power of not more than one-tenth of the total population. If the essential conditions are not fully organized, a further reduction of man power will result.

(*d*) Relative financial and economic conditions of nations.

The development of effective man power for war is inseparably connected with these features. Where these features are defective, or where the peace training system does not interweave therewith, there will result strains and limitations, with corresponding reductions of man power.

(*e*) Psychological fitness of the people of a nation for war.

A nation which for generations has directed all its energies to commercialism will be found peopled with those whose mental attributes unfit them for effective collective action in war; and such a nation cannot for a considerable period develop for war an effective peace-trained man power. On the other hand, a nation that has directed its energies toward military efficiency will be found with people mentally equipped for and capable of united action in war; and such a nation develops readily a full man power by its peace training.

It will be noted that the yearly cost per effective of man power is very much less in those nations that have universal service. This is but the natural result of the policy pursued. The English-speaking nations go into the labor market in wage competition for their professional soldiers. On the other hand, the nations with universal service coordinate their training with industrial and financial conditions; and pay their men under training a nominal sum, sufficient only for their minor wants and for the contentment of the average man.

THE SWISS SYSTEM

Sidney Ballou, pp. 23-25 in Pamphlet No. 125, published by Navy League of the United States.

Switzerland has had compulsory military training and service since the thirteenth century. Originally maintained by the separate cantons, her citizen army has been gradually brought under the control of the federal government. Central military authorities were first appointed in 1807, and since 1874 the army has been substantially federalized as it is today. The cantons, however, still have the appointment of officers, subject to federal regulations, together with many important obligations as to the organization of troops and the furnishings and upkeep of personal equipment.

The effect of compulsory military service, both upon the individual character of the Swiss and upon the destinies of the Swiss republic, are too well known to need detailed repetition. Completely surrounded by first-class powers, Switzerland has for centuries maintained her independence, her democratic institutions, and her self-respect. Her army has never undergone the test of modern warfare, a fact which may be attributed largely to her efficient preparedness, but at the outbreak of the European war she mobilized 200,000 men in ten days, and has an available second line of defense of a quarter of a million more. This with a population of 3,750,000.

Under the Swiss law every male citizen is liable for service from the beginning of the year in which he reaches the age of 20 until the end of the year in which he is 48. So much stress has been laid upon the calisthentic and military instruction given boys in the schools that there is an impression that this is part of the military law, but such is not the case. This military drill, together with the formation of cadet corps, boys' rifle clubs, etc., is encouraged in every way, but it is not part of the legal military system. It is the natural outgrowth of a system which instills into the mind of every man that he is to be trained to defend his country.

There are practically no exemptions in Switzerland except for physical disability. Every exempted person pays a military tax until he is 40. Criminals are debarred from the army, service being a privilege as well as a duty.

Between the ages of 20 and 32 the Swiss soldier is enrolled in the Elite. His first year's instruction, the main course, is 65 days of training for infantry, 75 days for artillery, and 90 days for cavalry, During the remainder of his service in the Elite he is liable to be called out for a repetition course of 11 days each year, but not for more than for seven courses if infantry, or eight if cavalry, in the eleven years.

Besides this field training, the soldier is obliged to do a considerable amount of target shooting each year. It is in connection with this that there appears the most distinctive feature of the Swiss system. After

the first course of instruction each soldier is allowed to take his rifle home, being responsible, of course, for its upkeep. The effect of this is that at the age when most healthy lads long for a gun of some kind the Swiss boy is given a modern army rifle, with some free ammunition and opportunity to get more at less than cost. His required target practice may be done in connection with some organized rifle club, and prizes of all kinds are offered for competitions.

The result of all this is that rifle shooting is the national sport of Switzerland, and the Swiss are a nation of expert marksmen. Out of eighteen international rifle shooting matches from 1897 to 1914, including Camp Perry, U. S. A., in 1913, the Swiss have won seventeen. They have not lost a match since 1898.

It was at the opening of the Jungfrau railroad that the celebrated conversation with the Kaiser occurred. Thirty thousand troops had been paraded before the German Emperor. "All very well," remarked the Kaiser to the Swiss officer in command, "but suppose I should lead sixty thousand Germans against them." "In that case, your Majesty," was the reply, "we should each have to shoot twice."

Who can say what the realization that this was no empty boast has saved Switzerland?

At the age of 33 the Swiss soldier passes into the first reserve, or Landwehr, in which he remains until he is 40. During this period he is called out once for an eleven-day repetition course. From 41 to 48 he is in the second reserve or Landwehr.

The Swiss system, the outgrowth of centuries of experience, is such a complete answer to many objections made to compulsory service, and is so far ahead of the bungling attempts of our own nation "to provide for the common defense," that there is small wonder that it evokes considerable enthusiasm among those who have made it a study. Nevertheless there are certain features which might be improved and others as to which it is doubtful if they will bear transplanting.

In the first place, the first training period is too short, even after the thorough preparatory training given by the schools. This is the testimony of the Swiss officers themselves, who have said that, with all allowance for the spirit and physique of the Swiss, the minimum training necessary to prepare a soldier is: infantry 200 days; cavalry 12 months; artillery 300 days. In the second place, it is doubtful whether the plan of allowing each man to keep his rifle at home would be feasible with our heterogeneous, migratory, and undisciplined population. If not, the plans for encouragement of rifle shooting, as well as for mobilization, would have to be considerably modified. Nevertheless, the adoption of any system founded upon the principle of universal military

service would be such a long step in advance that it would be well not to be too captious as to whether it is fully adequate at the start. The country would soon get over its first shock of immersion, find its liberties still unendangered, realize that it was beginning to feel its own strength, and, freed from a lot of sentimental folly, would revise its ideas from a practical standpoint.

THE ARGENTINE SYSTEM

Sidney Ballou, pp. 25-29 in Pamphlet No. 125, published by Navy League of the United States.

For a final study of possible military systems to serve us as a model, let us turn our eyes southward. Nobody has been conscious of any wave of militarism sweeping up from South America, nor that the republics of that continent have begun to strut around with chips on their shoulders. Yet practically every republic in South America has a system of compulsory military service on its statute book and is enforcing it with different degrees of effectiveness according to its financial ability. Argentina is in the lead with regard to the completeness and efficiency of her military system, which has recently attracted increased attention since it has become known that the general staff of our army is considering it in preparing recommendations for legislation by Congress.

The Argentine law declares that obligatory military service is alike for all and continuous for 25 years, from the age of 20 to the age of 45.

Within three months after reaching the age of 18 years—that is, two years before beginning service—every male citizen must enroll at the recruiting office in his district. If he claims exemption, his claim is passed on by a board. Exemption laws are liberal, applying principally at this period to two classes: those physically unfit and those having widowed mothers or elderly relatives dependent on them for support. Certificates of exemption, however, are taxed at various rates, running as high as 25 pesos, or $12, so that the principle that each individual owes service or its equivalent is enforced at the outset.

On January 1 following the attainment of the twentieth year, the citizen begins his one year of military training in the federal army. Argentina does not, as a matter of fact, train all those who are thus liable. Lots are drawn, and the navy takes as many as are required from the highest numbers, usually about 4,000. These must serve two years, that being the minimum time in which the highly specialized training of the navy can be given. The next in order, up to the number desired, from the year's class for the army. Formerly 12,000 were thus trained, now 18,000 are taken.

Citizens of a certain standard of education may, instead of serving this year, volunteer as officers of the reserve army—the reserve army consisting of those who have served their year and are between 20 and 30.

These volunteer officers take a three months course of intensive training, at the end of which they are either commissioned as officers of the reserve or, failing, are sent to serve their year with the colors.

Another important opportunity is furnished to shorten the year of military service. Any man who claims and can prove that he is sufficiently proficient with the rifle according to army standards is mustered out after three months service.

It would seem that a provision of this kind in our proposed law would be a sufficient inducement to develop military drill and target practice in the preparatory schools, without any direct legislation requiring such preliminary training. Argentina has found it so.

The year's training of recruits is conducted with the primary object of educating them to be soldiers. If a man learns readily he can get an occasional furlough; farm hands are sometimes excused for the time necessary to harvest their crops. There is no spirit of imposing unnecessary hardship upon the individual, merely an insistence that he shall learn in that time to be an efficient defender of his country.

After one year of service in the permanent army of the line the citizen passes to the reserve army, where he remains until he is thirty years old. During that time he is subject to be called out for maneuvers for two periods of one month each. In Argentina, for financial reasons, this maximum service is seldom required.

When reserves are thus called out for maneuvers they are mustered into their old regiments, thus sometimes doubling or trebling the number of men in a company and in a regiment. The result of this system is that the colonels and higher officers of the regular army are still in command of the larger units, while the additional captains and lieutenants required are supplied by the officers of the reserve army already mentioned.

Besides the liability to be called for maneuvers, each member of the reserve army must shoot a minimum of 50 rounds at target practice each year. This he does at his convenience, or in voluntary rifle clubs. Rifle clubs are encouraged by opportunity to get ammunition cheaply and by handsome prizes for competitions.

The officers of the reserve army, besides being subject to be called out with their men, may also be called out for instruction for two additional periods of fifteen days each. This is, of course, usually in connection with the regular army maneuvers.

The permanent army of Argentina at any one time consists of the men undergoing their year's training, backed by a paid army of 5,000 men. These paid men are non-commissioned officers, musicians, and

the like, who by remaining in the service with each new batch of recruits, give continuity to the service. In case of necessity the executive may keep the men then in training under arms an additional three months while the new class is being mustered in. In case of actual war the reserve army, those who have been through their year of training, would of course be called out by classes as required.

All this time, from his twentieth to his thirtieth year the soldier has been in the Army of the Line under the direct control of the Federal Government. From his thirtieth to his fortieth year he is in the National Guard. This means, as it would mean with us, that he is turned over to the states. The various states control their national guards just as our states would under the Constitution. The governors have the appointment of officers, and each state looks after its own troops. The National Guard is legally liable to be called out four times for fifteen days each during the ten years, but this is left to the states, with such assistance from the Federal Government in regard to arms, clothing, and subsistence as is necessary.

The last phase of service in Argentina is the Territorial Guard. This includes men from 40 to 45 years old. The appointment of officers and general control is still in the states. There is no obligation for maneuver service nor any form of foreign service in time of war. They are designed as a home garrison in time of extreme emergency.

In Argentina there certainly exists no suspicion that the adoption of this system has resulted in the many evils vividly prophesied by the pacifists. On the contrary, it is universally regarded as one of the corner-stones of constitutional democracy. In an address before the American Bar Association on the subject of Argentine Constitutional Ideas, Ambassador Naon said:

"Besides the principle of equality of rights, and as a correlative thereof, it has always been an Argentine constitutional idea that every citizen bears the responsibility of the national defense, and, therefore, that it is his duty to take up arms in its behalf. This constitutional idea has been guaranteed by the enactment of laws which establish the principle of compulsory military service for the organization of the national army and navy, constituting, in conjunction with the principles of compulsory primary education and compulsory universal suffrage, the three corner-stones upon which the entire structure of Argentine democracy rests, that is to say, the mental and moral vigor, together with the civic capacity and the defensive strength which constitute, combined, the guaranty of the organization, the practice and the maintenance of democratic institutions."

Brief*

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

RESOLVED, *That the United States Government should adopt a policy of requiring one year of military training of all able-bodied men before they reach the age of 21.*

INTRODUCTION

I. War is not even yet a thing of the past, and world peace has yet to be secured.
   A. Recent events prove only too clearly that war is still possible.
   B. National distrust still stands in the way of disarmament.
   C. Even the League of Nations contemplates a policy of policing.

II. The proposed substitutes for war have not proven adequate.
   A. Arbitration is not binding unless backed by force.
   B. Treaties between nations have proven valueless in time of war.
   C. Non-resistance never has prevented aggression.
   D. The League of Nations is an untried and unproven instrument.

III. Expert opinion is divided as to the best method of conserving our national human resources. One school holds that compulsory military training is the best means for accomplishing this end.

IV. The issues seem to be:
   A. Is the United States in need of greater military protection now than in the past?
   B. Is this need best met by adopting a policy of requiring military training for one year?
   C. Are the secondary benefits to be derived from universal military training of sufficient value to warrant its adoption as a national policy in any event?

AFFIRMATIVE

I. The United States is in need of greater military protection than in the past, for—
   A. In time of need the present policy of the United States did not furnish adequate protection, for
      1. Our standing army was too small, for
         a. We sent into the Great War, in one year, a force twenty times the size of our standing army.

---

*Acknowledgment is here made of the valuable service rendered by G. M. McKie, Associate Professor of Public Speaking, in helping to prepare this brief.

2. Our navy was insufficient, for
   a. Before our entrance into the Great War, the Navy Department immediately adopted a program calling for a greatly increased navy.
3. Although modern warfare demands not only great land and sea forces but air forces as well, yet the United States was not provided with such forces, for
   a. Congress had to authorize immediate procedure on an emergency program of airplane construction.
4. Our vast extent of coast line, both on the continent and in our insular possessions, was and is practically without defense, for
   a. There is not and has not been even a pretense to defend more than our important harbors.
5. Our reserve forces and equipment were inadequate, for
   a. Forces were raised by a resort to the draft system.
   b. Equipment was provided by
      1. The conversion of manufacturing plants into ammunition and ordnance factories.
      2. The building of immense new plants for the manufacture of war equipment.
      3. The commandeering of men, materials, and factories for the performance of special tasks; such as the designing, perfecting, and manufacturing of submarine detectors, submarine chasers, rapid-fire guns, and the Liberty Motor.

B. In the light of the expanded application of the Monroe Doctrine there will be need for a larger measure of protection, for
   1. The United States must bear its share of the responsibility for
      a. The peace of the world.
      b. The protection of weaker nations.

C. Our present industrial conditions make Bolshevism in the United States a menace, for
   1. It is already a world menace, as witness Russia and Germany.
   2. Our rapidly developing industrial system has tended to accentuate the strained relations between labor and capital.

D. Past experience has shown the necessity of considering the Japanese and the Mexican questions as special problems, for
   1. The difficulties in both cases have grown out of peculiar conditions in the nations involved, for
      a. In the case of Japan, the question of state sovereignty is involved, and
      b. In the case of Mexico, the problem is one of control within the nation itself.

II. This need of greater protection is best met by adopting the policy of requiring military training for one year, for
   A. The men in training at any given time would be a sufficient mobile army.
   B. Officer material could be selected and trained, thus providing a constant supply of instructors for raw recruits.
   C. Men for the navy and recruits for the aviation corps would be provided.
   D. Men who had completed their period of training would provide an ample reserve.
   E. It is the only system of providing defense which is in harmony with a democratic form of government.
   F. It has proven effective in the democracies that have tried it; such as
      1. Argentina.
      2. Australia.
      3. Switzerland.

III. The secondary benefits to be derived from universal military training are of sufficient value to warrant its adoption as a national policy in any event, for
   A. The training would be given at the most favorable time in the life of the individual, for
      1. It would come before the vigor of youth is past.
      2. It would come at a time to cause the least disturbance to industrial pursuits.
      3. It would be completed before the men would assume domestic responsibilities.
   B. The training would yield distinct personal benefits, namely:
      1. Physical.
      2. Moral.
      3. Civic.
      4. Economic.
      5. Educational.

NEGATIVE

I. The United States is not in need of greater military protection now than in the past, for
   A. In the recent time of need the present policy of the United States furnished adequate protection, for
      1. An army twenty times the size of our standing army was raised and equipped in less than a year.
      2. Our navy was able to respond in force to Great Britain's call for assistance in combating the submarine.
      3. Although aviation was a new arm of warfare, yet we made a signal contribution to the allied control of the air.

4. Since the present policy of the United States did furnish an adequate army, naval, and aviation force, it will furnish a sufficient coast defense, which the plan of the affirmative will not do, for
   a. Coast defense demands highly trained experts in the mechanics of coast defense artillery.
5. Although in the past our militia system as a reserve has been subjected to much criticism and ridicule, yet in the recent crisis its members formed the nucleus of our expeditionary force, and, therefore, may be depended upon to supply a sufficient reserve.
6. Although it is possible to maintain that our present policy would not provide adequate equipment, yet requiring military *training* for one year equally would not provide adequate military *equipment.*

B. The extended responsibility of the United States, brought about by the expanded application of the Monroe Doctrine, is merely a part of the general responsibility shared by all nations and expressed in the League of Nations, for
   1. The United States will undoubtedly be a member of the League of Nations and will contribute its share of the International Police Force, thus help to maintain the peace of the world and provide protection for weaker nations.

C. Our industrial relations are so well adjusted that the danger of class war is chimerical, for
   1. In the recent crisis there was no portion of the population of the United States which supported the Government more whole-heartedly than did the industrial classes.

D. Difficulties rising out of the Japanese or Mexican situation do not constitute a menace, for
   1. They would be matters to be settled, not by force of arms, but by process of law as expressed in the courts of the League of Nations.

II. Admitting that there is need of greater military protection now than in the past, the proposition of the Affirmative is not the best way to meet this need, for

A. The needs of the League of Nations can best be met, not by a larger, partially trained force, but by a smaller, highly trained force.

B. The contention of the Affirmative that the proposed policy is the only democratic policy is false, for
   1. Out of our democratic volunteer system has evolved our marine corps, which is a highly trained and highly efficient volunteer fighting force, as witness Chateau Thierry.

C. Although it may be admitted that the proposed policy has proved effective in a few isolated instances, yet we have shown that it will be ineffective and unnecessary under the League of Nations.

III. The claim of secondary benefits to be derived from universal military training cannot be substantiated, for

A. In some of their contentions, the Affirmative assume that this training *must* be given at some time in the life of every citizen, and that, therefore, the proposed time is the best; but this is only an assumption, for

1. Under the plan of a League of Nations, this training would not necessarily be given to any large number of citizens.

B. The personal benefits claimed for the plan are, to say the least, doubtful, for military training

1. Is inferior to ordinary gymnastics for all-round physical development, and must be corrected by them.
2. Provides no physical training for girls, who for reasons of individual health and the health of the race need it more than boys.
3. Does not give grace and erect carriage, but makes boys angular and round-shouldered.
4. Inculcates only the passive qualities, such as blind obedience to authority. Does not produce initiative, self-reliance, and power to think for oneself, which are the best kinds of preparedness for citizenship.
5. Emphasizes physical rather than moral courage, ignores the rule of reason, and sanctions the right of might.
6. Deprives the individual of a year of preparation for industrial or professional pursuit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A list of publications containing valuable material on the query under discussion is given below. The books and magazines can be secured from their publishers. Included in the bibliography are the names of a number of organizations and bureaus which will be glad to furnish material as far as they are able.

GENERAL REFERENCES

The Bureau of Extension of the University of North Carolina will furnish material in addition to this bulletin, such as it may be able to obtain from time to time. Address the Bureau of Extension, Chapel Hill, N. C.

The North Carolina Library Commission will furnish traveling package libraries on the question upon the request of the principal of the school. Address Mrs. Minnie Leatherman Blanton, Secretary, Raleigh, North Carolina.

The Wilson Package Library, consisting of articles clipped from magazines, documents, and pamphlets, will be loaned upon application to the H. W. Wilson Company, 958-964 University Ave., New York, N. Y. The minimum charge for the first one to seven articles on each topic in each order is 50 cents; additional articles, 5 cents each.

The North Carolina Senators and Representatives in Congress will furnish from congressional sources such material as is at their disposal, upon request.

Eliot, C. W., Shall We Adopt Universal Military Service? World's Work, Vol. 3, pp. 16-24.

Faesch, Remy, Swiss Army System, 25c. G. E. Stechert, N. Y. 1916.

Mabie, E. C., University Debaters' Annual, 1915-1916. $1.80. In pamphlet form 75c. H. W. Wilson Co., N. Y.

Muirhead, J. F., Conscription: A Summary of the Arguments for and Against Compulsory Service. Nation, Vol. 101, p. 402.

Nichols, E. R., Intercollegiate Debates. Vol. 6, pp. 315-377. Contains debate on both sides by Colo. Agri. Coll. and Kans. Agri. Coll. on this question, except that the age limit is "25 years." Hinds, Hayden & Eldredge, N. Y. 1916.

Palmer, J. M., Army of the People. $1. G. P. Putnam's Sons, N. Y.

Perry, R. B., Free Man and the Soldier. $1.40. Chas. Scribners' Sons, N. Y. 1916.

Roosevelt, T., Fear God and Take Your Own Part. Nation, Vol. 102, p. 518.

Wise, J. C., Call of the Republic. $1. E. P. Dutton & Co., N. Y. 1917.

Compulsory Service in a Democracy at War. Independent, Vol. 84, p. 372.

Compulsory Military Service. Rev. of Rev., Vol. 52, p. 608.

Making of Citizen Soldiers: How It Is Done in Switzerland and Australia. Outlook, Vol. 112, p. 307.

Must We All Bear Arms? Nation, Vol. 97, p. 278.

Swiss Military Training. Free. American Defense Society, N. Y. 1916.

AFFIRMATIVE

Chamberlain, G. R., Training Our Youth for Defense. Independent, Vol. 85, p. 15.

Conroy, G. R., Universal Obligatory Military Training and Service: A Catechism in Twelve Lessons. National Security League, 19 West 44th St., N. Y.

Coulton, C. G., Democracy and Compulsory Service. National Security League, 19 West 44th St., N. Y.

Hall, C. L., The Last Gasp of Voluntaryism. Outlook, Vol. 113, p. 918, Aug. 16, '16.

Harvey, G., Does Preparedness Mean Militarism? N. A. Review, Vol. 203, p. 340.

Johnson, R. M., Ounce of Prevention: Switzerland vs. Belgium With a Lesson for the United States. Century Magazine, Vol. 90, p. 17.

Nasmyth, G. W., Universal Military Service and Democracy. 5c. American Union Against Militarism, Washington, D. C.

Palmer, Frederick, The War's Lesson to Us. Collier's, Vol. 57, pp. 5-6.

Stimson, H. L., The Basis for National Military Training. National Security League, 19 West 44th St., N. Y.

Thompson, W. O., Preparedness and the People. Survey, Vol. 35, p. 743, March 25, '16.

Upton, Gen., The Military History of the United States. 65c. Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C.

Washburn, H. C., The American Blind Spot. Shows the failure of the volunteer system in the United States. Doubleday, Page & Co., Garden City, N. Y.

West, H. L., Universal Military Training. National Security League, 19 West 44th St., N. Y.

Wood, Leonard, Military Obligation of Citizenship. 75c. Princeton University Press.

Democratic Aspects of Universal Military Service. Rev. of Rev., Vol. 54, p. 339.

A Plan of Universal Selective Training. National Security League, 19 West 44th St., N. Y.

Universal Obligatory Military Training and Service. National Security League, 19 West 44th St., N. Y.

Universal Military Service is Needed for the Physical Welfare of Our Youth. National Security League, 19 West 44th St., N. Y.

NEGATIVE

Angell, Norman, Real Implications of Conscription. New Republic, Vol. 6, p. 266.

Browne, W. R., "Sweet Voices" of Conscription. Nation, Vol. 101, p. 715.

Colyer, W. T., Military Mind. Independent, Vol. 89, p. 22.

Dewey, John, Universal Service as Education. New Republic, Vol. 6, p. 309.

Villard, O. G., Universal Military Training: Our Latest Cure-All. Free. American Union Against Militarism, Westory Bldg., Washington, D. C.

Conscription is Undemocratic. Congressional Record, Vol. 54, pp. 290-4, Jan. 10, '17.

Federalization That Would Be Fatal. Scientific American, Vol. 114, p. 444.

Increase of the Military Establishment. Congressional Record, Vol. 55, pp. 1651-6, May 1, '17.

Universal Military Service Cure-All. Nation, Vol. 102, p. 510.

Volunteer Service vs. Conscription. Congressional Record, Vol. 55, pp. 2192-5, May 10, '17.

References---Affirmative

UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE

HENRY LITCHFIELD WEST, in Debaters Handbook Series. (Volume on Military Training, pp. 68-76.)

The assertion that the United States must ultimately adopt universal military training and service as the basis of national preparedness rests upon a logical and incontrovertible foundation. Two facts must be admitted, as follows:

First: That the United States will never possess a navy sufficiently large to thoroughly patrol and defend its extensive coast line.

Second: That American tradition and sentiment will prevent the creation and support of a permanent regular army large enough to combat successfully the enemy forces which could be landed upon our shores.

Granting that these two things are true, the defense of our country must inevitably depend upon an adequate force of citizen soldiery pursuing peaceful vocations under normal conditions, but thoroughly trained and equipped to meet immediately an emergency of threatened danger.

The navy is only the first line of defense. If we should have a navy of sufficient strength to overcome an opposing fleet or fleets at one or more points between Portland and Galveston or between Seattle and San Diego, the people of the United States could rest in certain security from attack. A navy of this size is, however, beyond our fondest hopes. It has taken England centuries to build up the navy which she now possesses, and the construction of a fleet equal to the British would not only require many years, but would entail an enormous cost upon our resources.

Even now, when the United States stands fourth in naval strength, there are other nations which could overcome our ships at sea, thus insuring a clear highway for the landing of transports, bringing literally hundreds of thousands of men.

A large standing army is equally impossible. As a matter of fact, this ought to be the case. To create and maintain a regular army of 500,000 men would be an enormous tax upon the American people, besides which it would be entirely out of harmony with all our traditions and ideals. Even should such an army be authorized, it is doubtful if it could be recruited. While the United States pays more per capita for its army than any other nation, it is extremely difficult to get men to surrender the opportunities of earning a livelihood in order to receive the meager compensation which the regular army affords. The effort to increase the regular army under the stress of the excitement on the Mexican border has not been successful. . . .

We speak of universal military training as if it were something new and at variance with the principles of our Government. Nothing could be further from the truth. The bitter experiences of the revolutionary war, when Washington secured an army with great difficulty, demonstrated to that great commander the fact that if our republic were to exist in the future, it must rely for its defense upon a trained citizen soldiery. He unquestionably had much to do with the constitutional declaration that "well-regulated militia is necessary to the security of a free state," and he went further in the statement that "a free people ought not only to be armed, but disciplined."

He emphasized his belief that the safety of the nation depended upon "an adequate stock of military knowledge for emergencies," and he advocated the spread of this knowledge among the entire American people. He saw very clearly that if the United States should become a nation so pacific as to be unable to defend itself, it would unquestionably become a prey to the greed and aggression of some more powerful nation. "If we desire to avoid insult," he said, "we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

Universal military training and service is the only system which is purely democratic. Thomas Jefferson, recognized as the founder and patron-saint of the Democratic party, emphasized this point of view. "We must train and classify the whole of our male citizens," he wrote to Monroe in 1813, after he had learned the lesson of unpreparedness in the War of 1812, "and make military instruction a regular part of collegiate education. We can never be safe till this is done." In 1814, he went still further and declared that it was an obvious truth "that we cannot be defended but by making every citizen a soldier, and that in doing this all must be marshaled, called by their ages, and every service ascribed to its competent class."

James Madison, a follower of Jefferson, urged in his message to Congress on December 3, 1816, the organization of a militia which would include practically every physically fit male in the republic, while James Monroe, in a message to Congress in 1822, urged the American people as a special duty "to be at all times prepared to defend the rights with which they are blessed and to surpass all others in sustaining the necessary burdens and in submitting to sacrifices to make such preparations."

Any unprejudiced reader of American history must realize that if the counsel of the fathers of our country had been followed a century ago we would have been saved unnecessary sacrifice of lives and money. In all of our wars the flower of our citizenship has paid the penalty of inexperience and unfitness. We have been victorious, but at tremendous cost. In the Revolutionary War, when our forces numbered 395,000 as against 150,000 of the enemy; in the War of 1812, when we had 350,000

men enrolled with only 57,000 against us; and when in the war with Mexico we had twice as many men in the field as the Mexicans, we were taught an experience which did not profit us. Even though we have never fought a first-class power, throwing its full resources into the opposing balance, we have never been able to win except by putting armies into the field greatly in excess of the other side.

It is not necessary, however, to rest our case for universal military training and service upon our own history. Switzerland at the present day affords an object lesson which we would do well to heed. The question came before the Swiss people in the form of a referendum upon the occasion of the adoption of the federal constitution in 1848, and by a popular vote of 170,000 to 70,000 the Swiss people decided that "every Swiss is open to do military service." It is safe to say that today not one vote would be cast in Switzerland against the system which has been in vogue there nearly seventy years. Every one knows that if it had not been for the demonstration of the instant ability of the Swiss people to defend their territorial integrity the German army would have sought entrance into France through Switzerland. The Swiss army is enrolled for defense, not offense; and every student of the Swiss army agrees that the Swiss system is the living refutation of the charge that military training hurts good citizenship. The Swiss is, above all things, a free man, and there is no taint of militarism in his nation. The trouble is, however, as was pointed out sixteen years ago in a report submitted by Lieut. Col. William Cary Sanger, that "universal military service still remains a theory with us, but in Switzerland it is real and actual." . . .

On the other hand, England, having failed to adopt a system whereby its people would be ready to meet danger, has paid a terrible penalty. For more than a decade far-sighted men in England have been pointing out that no provision was being made to train English citizenry so as to be available for defense. Possibly the futility of these appeals was largely due to the belief that the island was protected from invasion by the strength of the navy and that no conflict was possible which would involve English people. Events have proven, however, that this point of view was entirely false. It is now a matter of history that when universal war was declared on the Continent, England was able to send only a very few soldiers, comparatively speaking, to oppose the onward march of the German army through Belgium into France. It called upon its colonial dependencies for help, and then, after the war had begun, undertook to train and equip 4,000,000 of its citizens.

It was nine months or a year before Lord Kitchener felt that his men were in condition to be sent against the trained veterans of the enemy, and the result was that all attempts to check the onward advances of the German forces were at first futile. The United States would undergo a similar experience if today a hostile army should land upon its coast

or cross its borders. The men who would instantly volunteer to save their country would be utterly unprepared, not only physically but in the essential of necessary training and equipment. Untrained millions are nothing but an untrained mob. It is a matter of education to bring the American people to a realization of this fact. . . .

As for individual endorsements, pages might be filled with utterances of men recognized as leaders. Space allows only the following:

Theodore Roosevelt: "I believe in universal service based upon universal training. I believe in this because I think it would be not only of incalculable benefit to the nation in the event of war, but of incalculable benefit to the individuals undergoing it, and therefore to the nation as a whole as regards the work of peace. The military tent, where boys sleep side by side, will rank next to the public school among the great agents of democracy." . . .

Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War: "I cannot believe that I have the right to expect another man to defend my home and my family, if I am unwilling to defend them myself. It is essentially a democratic principle that every citizen should be willing to contribute his personal service to the common defense."

General Leonard Wood: "The volunteer system has never succeeded, and never will. The only true ideal is obligatory military service. Manhood suffrage and manhood service must go together." . . .

Samuel Gompers, President American Federation of Labor: "We must have a preparation that means a comprehensive development of all the powers and resources of all our citizens. In Switzerland every man is a soldier—not necessarily to go to war, but he has the physical and manual training necessary to defend himself, his family, and his country. Under that system the Swiss have developed a manhood, a character, that challenges the admiration of the world. We will be satisfied with nothing less in America." . . .

Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of War: "This problem of national defense will never be permanently solved until it is distributed among the whole people by some system of universal liability to military training."

EVERY COLLEGE SHOULD INTRODUCE MILITARY TRAINING

President Schurman, of Cornell, in *Everybody's Magazine*, Vol. 32, pp. 120-128.

. . . In 1913 the reserves of Japan were 1,000,000, of Italy, 1,500,000, of Austria, 2,500,000, of France, 3,000,000, of Germany, 4,700,000, and of Russia 5,400,000. The reserves of England numbered only 215,000; and hence, when the war broke out in August, 1914, Lord Kitchener's first task was to get together a million or two of civilians

and give them a military training such as the reserves of the other belligerents had (in larger measure) already received; and for that training he stipulated a minimum period of six months.

The United States has *no* reserves.

If an invading power succeeded in breaking through the line of our navy and coast defenses, there would be nothing to prevent its landing on our shores as many soldiers as it had transports to carry. For we have a standing army so small that it would be overcome by sheer force of numbers unless it were reinforced by armies of trained civilians.

Our regular army now consists of 4,701 officers and 87,781 enlisted men; the number of them that can be moved from place to place—the mobile army—amounts to 2,935 officers and 51,446 men, of whom there are in Continental United States only 1,495 officers and 29,405 men. The organized militia of the various states aggregates 8,323 officers and 119,087 men, of whom it is estimated by experts not more than 50 or 60 per cent would prove effective military material in time of need.

But even if we make the inconceivable supposition that in the event of war they would all respond to the summons of the national government, and that they are all efficient, we should have a force, regulars and militia together, to send against the enemy who had broken through our navy and coast defenses and had invaded our territory, of only 9,818 officers and 148,492 men.

Of course the *actual* numbers of our army of defense would be much less. When allowance is made for the inevitable shrinkage of our imaginary militia strength, General Wood estimates that our available mobile force to send against an invader would be less than 90,000 men, whereas 300,000, he declares, would be necessary at the outset to give us a reasonable chance of success.

The problem of reserves is, therefore, twofold. In the first place, a reserve force of over 200,000 men would be absolutely essential for immediate coöperation with the regular army and the organized militia as soon as the invader should have overcome our naval and coast defenses. And, secondly, a volunteer army would have to be immediately got together and trained for the further prosecution of the war. And this army, if we may judge either from the experience of our Civil War or from the demonstration now afforded by the European belligerents, might in a great emergency have to be counted in terms of many hundreds of thousands, if not of a million or more.

Let us now consider the first of these problems. We must have a military force, ready for immediate service in time of war, of at least 300,000 men. At present we have, regulars and militia together, only about 25 per cent of the required strength. How shall we get the remaining 75 per cent? . . .

Military training teaches the young man how to stand and walk and hold himself; it gives him vigorous out-of-door exercise so that gradually his chest expands and his muscles grow firm; it inures him to physical hardships; it disciplines him on orderliness, punctuality, accuracy, and alertness; it endows the senses and the intellect with quickness, precision, and the habit of concentrated attention; it develops self-control as well as obedience to proper authority and resistance to improper; it accustoms the individual to coöperation and team-work, while fostering comradeship, thus facilitating community life and lubricating social intercourse; and it prepares youth for better citizenship by constantly emphasizing the conceptions of duty and service.

If wars were banished from our planet I would retain military training side by side with athletics as an instrument of physical education in our universities; and not only for its physical advantages, great as they are, but also for its moral, mental, social, and civic effects and reactions.

But war is still a part of any human life we see or can reasonably expect. The millenium of peace is a dream we do well to cherish; it is an ideal toward which civilization is conducting our race. But it would be foolish to treat it as a reality or a probable attainment within the short space of our own or our children's generation. . . .

SHALL WE ADOPT UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE?

Charles W. Eliot, in World's Work, Vol. 33; pp. 16-24.

. . . Why should the American people make this formidable change in their national habits and their international policy? First, because the industrial and commercial interests of the nation have completely changed since the Civil War, and can no longer be preserved and promoted in isolation. The country cannot keep its existing machinery running, or sell its surplus foods and raw materials, unless the foreign markets are open to it, and are freely developed. The United States, having become an industrial and commercial world power, needs to have all the seas and oceans of the world open for its foreign trade in times of peace, and so far as is practicable in times of war also—open for both its imports and its exports of foods, drinks, drugs, raw materials, and manufactured articles.

So long as the British navy ruled the seas, freedom for American trade with all nations was secure in peaceful times, and with Great Britain and her allies in war times; but the war has demonstrated that Great Britain can no longer secure the freedom of the seas for herself and other nations without assistance. During the present war the combined navies of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Russia have not suc-

ceeded in maintaining an effectual blockade of all German, Austrian, Bulgarian, and Turkish ports, or in preventing the destruction of an immense tonnage of merchantmen belonging to the Entente Allies, with their cargoes. Although many German and Austrian submarines have been destroyed, and a few short lines of transportation by water have been made safe against submarines, it cannot be said today that adequate means of defending commercial vessels and fishermen against destruction by hostile submarines have been discovered, or that the full power of the submarine to destroy enemies' property, or to maintain some foreign commerce in spite of a blockade, has as yet been developed and exhibited. The world still has much to learn about the functions of the submarine. Hence it follows that the task of keeping the oceans safe for the commerce of the free, manufacturing nations—to which foreign commerce is indispensable—is one in which the United States may reasonably be expected to take its fair part. It is not doing so now. If the United States expects to share the benefits of the resistance the Entente Allies are making to the domination of seas and lands by Germany, should it not also prepare to share the terrible sacrifices that resistance costs?

America No Longer Physically Isolated

Secondly, steam and electricity have done away with the physical isolation of the United States. The oceans are not barriers but highways which invite the passage of fleets, pacific or hostile. The security of America can no longer be trusted to the width of the Atlantic and the Pacific.

If any one says that the risk of an invasion of the United States by a strong naval and military power is very small, particularly within twenty years of the close of the present terrifying and exhausting war, the answer is that, since the war in Europe has demonstrated how horrible a catastrophe an invasion would be, the American people may wisely insure themselves against even a small risk of invasion. The only available insurance is a navy powerful in every respect, and an army in reserve visibly strong in numbers and visibly prepared for immediate service.

If We Had Universal Service

If the principle of universal military service should be accepted and acted on in the United States, several important consequences would immediately follow:

1. The country would always have on call a trained force for all the duties and services which the Regular Army now performs, and this force could be increased by telegraph and telephone to any desired extent up to the limit of the reserves. Within ten years these reserves would be formidable in number. It would probably be desirable to

maintain a special force for a service of two years in the Philippines, the Panama Zone, and other outlying regions; but this force should consist of young men who volunteered for that special service after they had received the universal training at home, or the better part of it.

2. It would no longer be necessary to maintain any state militia; provided the governors were authorized to call on the National War Department for any troops they might need for local service. But if any state preferred to do so, it might maintain a local volunteer force made up of young men who had already served their first period (sixty to ninety days) in the national army.

3. The nation would be always prepared for defensive combat with any military power which might assail it for purposes of conquest or ransom; and, being prepared, would probably be safe from such attempts.

4. In case of rebellion or outbreak of any sort within the country itself, a national force could be promptly put into the field to subdue it.

5. All the able-bodied young men in the country would receive a training in the hard work of a soldier which would be of some service to them in any industry in which they might afterward engage. They would have become accustomed to a discipline under which many men coöperate strenuously in the pursuit of common objects. They would have mastered the use of some instruments of precision, and would have learned much about personal and public hygiene, and the means of preserving bodily vigor and utilizing it to advantage.

6. The defense of the country would be always in charge of a navy and army neither feudal nor mercenary, neither drafted "for the war" nor professional in the sense that its members mean to spend their active lives in the service, but on the contrary composed of all the able-bodied youth of the nation, acting under a universal sense of obligation or duty, but also willing to serve the country in a hearty coöperative spirit out of love of freedom, justice, and all that makes "home."

7. In case of war, large or small, long or short, the great waste of lives and money which has taken place at the beginning of every war in which the United States has been engaged since the Government was organized would be avoided; because the country would have at call any desired number of competent officers and well-trained men. In case of war alarms the country would not be obliged to summon untrained militia, or to resort to such crude and unsound methods as Plattsburg camps and college regiments.

Moral Advantages of Strength

Some moral advantages would result to the United States from maintaining the second navy in the world and a numerous army always ready. A strong democracy, always prepared to defend itself against attacks from without or within, would be less exposed to intentional

provocation by critical or jealous governments, and less liable to the occasional internal panics which are apt to cause wastes and other unnecessary evils. Some improvement in the character and efficiency of the American people itself might also be expected, especially in regard to coöperative discipline, self-reliance, and self-control. To be always ready to defend and to maintain American ideals of public justice and liberty would add to the self-respect of the people. If every able-bodied youth were well trained for service in the national army or navy at some serious sacrifice of his ease and earning time, and then held himself constantly in readiness to fight for his country, if it were in peril, until he became too old for soldier's work, the whole people would soon attain to a new sentiment of patriotic duty and self-sacrificing devotion to the country as the ground-work of home, kinship, and friendship, and the representative of public justice and liberty and of progressive hope for mankind. The entire nation, without distinction of race or class, would be taught to think of itself as a unified and exalted power for good in the world—humane, unselfish, and aspiring.

Our Duty Toward World Peace

To protect this country and its productive industries and to exalt the patriotic sentiments of its people are, however, not the only or the strongest motives for abandoning the precious traditional policies of the United States in respect to isolation and the avoidance of foreign entanglements. Durable peace can be maintained after the present war only by a dominant force too strong for Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria, separately, or in any possible combination, or with any imaginable allies, to attack or to resist. A limited alliance of competent nations—three, four, or five—can promptly provide such a force already trained to concurrent, coöperative action. Federations and parliaments of the world could not do it. They would be too complicated, vast, slow, and unstable. The "Concert of Europe" is utterly discredited, because it has too often brought about, or permitted, concerted injustice, and perpetuated poisonous wrongs. There is no hope of establishing lasting peace through any treaty-making which should include the Central Monarchies. Their acts since July, 1914, prove beyond a doubt that no reliance is to be placed on any pledges or treaties signed by them. No verbal or written evidence of a change of heart on the part of the German people could be depended on. If such a change shall happily occur, the rest of the world will not trust it until its reality is proved by a long course of rational and honorable conduct.

MILITARY TRAINING A NECESSITY

WILLIAM R. CASTLE, JR., in Debaters' Handbook Series. (Volume on Military Training, p. 113.)

The necessity of preparedness is fact, not theory. The obligation on every able-bodied man to defend his country is fact, not theory. And the best defense of the legitimate rights of the country, the best defense against the very possibility of hostilities, is adequate military preparation. A man who builds a house in a district known to be infested with burglars does not wait until the thief is at the door to order a lock. The very fact that the house is furnished with locks and burglar alarms tends to keep the burglar away. It is just as sensible to say that reasonable military preparedness makes a nation eager to go to war as to say that putting locks on one's own doors makes one eager to be a thief.

Two methods of meeting our obvious need are possible. We may materially increase the size of our voluntary professional army, or we may resort to universal compulsory military training.

A larger professional army would certainly be better than nothing. It would not permanently solve our problem.

The only alternative is some kind of universal military service, and this has a horrid sound to pacifists and to the great mass of selfish citizens who angrily grasp the fact that it means self-sacrifice on their part as well as on the part of those who, so far, have borne all the burden. . . .

The arguments against national service are as many as they are unsound or ignoble. It is necessary to look at only one or two, since in them are included all which have any semblance of validity. Such service is said, first of all, to be economically impossible; young men must not be drawn, at a critical period of their lives, from their work or their study, as the case may be; the productive power of the community would, in consequence, be immeasurably decreased. This argument is heard almost if not quite as often as the other, but it is seldom enunciated with such violence. National service is undemocratic, one hears on every side, because it is compulsory. America is a free country.

First as to the economic argument. It is perhaps no answer, but it is nevertheless a fact, that Germany and France, with their two years service—the three years of France has not been fully tested—have by no means fallen behind the rest of the world in their producing power. Only a very bold man would assert the United States to be more efficient, commercially, than is Germany. Perhaps it would be fairer, however, to confine ourselves to America. The claim of interference with study is mere nonsense, because college men would, after learning the lessons of economy of time, of promptness in filling engagements, of strict performance of duty of the moment, be able to pursue their

studies to far greater advantage. Or, if the Swiss system of short terms of service were adopted, they would be better mentally and physically after summers in camp than after summers spent in the idle pursuit of pleasure. As to those who must almost in boyhood become producers, the argument in favor of such training is even stronger. Such men are apt to become weak physically—they do not stand straight, they do not breathe enough fresh air, they do not know how to use their muscles to the best advantage, they begin to grow old at forty. For such men military training in the open would be invaluable. By slightly curtailing the period of production in youth this training would extend it greatly in middle age, not to speak of the fact that it would undoubtedly increase the productive power at all stages. These things are admitted by all nations which have universal military training. No measure which will sensibly increase the productive power of the nation can wisely be attacked on economic grounds.

Even less defensible is the strident accusation that military national service is undemocratic. It is rather the very essence of true democracy because no exceptions are made, and because it is the effort of all alike for the common good. In one period of life, at least, it is the perfect recognition of equality.

National service would go very far toward breaking up unfortunate feelings of class rivalry, because such feelings rest largely on misunderstandings. We estimate each other largely by our clothes. When we are stripped artificial differences disappear. In the military camp, where all are dressed alike, it is character, and character only, that counts. Our young men would learn to estimate each other by standards of quickness of wit and of body, of manliness, and chivalry, and honor, not by outward appearances. The fellow who has been brought up in luxury would cease, for the time being, to feel immensely superior to the fellow whom he had seen driving an express wagon, unless that fellow were actually inferior in character, and he would never forget that the man in the street is still a man, with all the rights of a man. And, conversely, the poor boy, who has somehow scrambled through a few years of life in the slums, would learn not to despise the rich man's son, whose muscles are as strong as his own; he would not forget in after life that such a man, also, has his rights as a man and that they are worthy of consideration. Nothing is so destructive of unfair class prejudice as contact on equal terms.

Most important of all, perhaps, this national service, which would demand of every man a certain proportion of his material goods and a definite amount of his time, would be recognized by every one as support of the nation, and would therefore increase sane and loyal patriotism. It would discourage undesirable immigration because the chief object of many of our undesirable immigrants is to escape just such service. It would materially aid, therefore, in the industrial reorgani-

zation which has become more than ever necessary since the great war has disrupted and will, for years to come, prevent the normal reintegration of trade and industrial relations between the nations. By discouraging undesirable immigrants national service would help to hold America for Americans; would so increase individual efficiency that our industries would not suffer from the diminution in the stream of immigration; so decrease the causes of the friction by the removal of foolish misunderstandings; so raise the national morale by emphasizing the responsibility of every citizen, that he should be able to hold, through common effort, the accidental preëminence given us by the war in Europe.

Ten years ago the man who dared to advocate national service would have been derided as un-American. Today he who raises the standard is listened to at least respectfully, as one whose arguments must be considered, however wrong they are. Those only turn aside with a sneer who are too selfish to allow anything to interfere with their private pursuit of pleasure or of gain, and those who see in the ability to stand straight, to obey quickly, and to shoot a rifle in the direction intended, some queerly indefinable connection with a lust for conquest. National service would not make the country perfect. It would go a long way toward eradicating the selfishness, the shiftlessness, the lack of discipline, which are at the bottom of a large part of our national ills. It would not be an economic calamity but an economic advantage; it would not be undemocratic, but rather the final assertion of the right of democracy to live.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Major-General Hugh L. Scott, from his report of September 30th, 1916.

In my judgment, the country will never be prepared for defense until we do as other great nations do that have large interests to guard, like Germany, Japan, and France, where everybody is ready and does perform military service in time of peace as he would pay every other tax and is willing to make sacrifices for the protection he gets and the country gets in return. The volunteer system in this country, in view of the highly organized, trained, and disciplined armies that our possible opponents possess, should be relegated to the past. There is no reason why one woman's son should go out and defend or be trained to defend another woman and her son who refuses to take training or give service. The only democratic method is for every man in his youth to become trained in order that he may render efficient service if called upon in war.

Universal military training has been the corner-stone upon which has been built every republic in the history of the world, and its abandonment the signal for decline and obliteration. This fact was fully recog-

nized by the makers of our Constitution and evidenced in our early laws. A regular army was regarded as inconsistent with the principles of free government, dangerous to free institutions, and apart from the necessities of the times. All were imbued with a patriotism which would make them stand shoulder to shoulder in upholding the laws, and in the defense of the common country, sharing equally the blessings of peace and the hardship of war. The law required every able-bodied male between 18 and 45 years to keep himself provided with rifle and ammunition and to attend muster, and was in effect compulsory military service. They were called together for training at muster time only, for the outdoor life of the early settlers was considered sufficient training for any military duty they were then liable to be called upon to perform. Unfortunately the doctrine of states' rights crept in to prevent the enforcement of Federal law, and each State was left to build up its militia. The Regular Army existed as a small force to protect the western march of civilization from Indian foray, and, notwithstanding its brilliant record, the attitude of a great mass of our people continued hostile to the soldier, so much so that several states and Congress have in recent times had to pass laws to insure respect to the uniform and its wearers in public places. Some of our states, while extending the right to vote to aliens of a few months residence who have declared their intention to become citizens, deny it absolutely to persons in the military and naval service of the United States, putting them in a class with the criminal and insane.

It is vital that our ideas with reference to military service be regenerated. For our small army we go into the labor market for recruits. When the demand for labor is lax, the stipend of the soldier attracts; when the daily wage goes up, recruiting is at its lowest ebb. There is no appeal to patriotism, no appeal for the individual to obtain military training as the highest duty of his citizenship. Enlistment is held out as a job in which the individual gets small pay but is well cared for, with an outdoor, wholesome life and retirement on three-quarters pay and allowances after thirty years of service, and it is accepted as a job. This view was given added emphasis by the last session of Congress. The national defense act prohibits enlisted men from engaging in any civil occupations, whether for pay or otherwise, that would put them in competition with men in civil life. The fine quality of our enlisted men is due to the care in accepting recruits and to the development of character which service under the flag directed by competent leaders gives men, when the realization comes that their lives are committed to the upholding of the laws of the Union. The generally accepted idea that the annual per cent of desertions is a serious reflection upon the discipline and training in the Army is in serious error. The Army will show a smaller per cent of men leaving their contract and job than any business enterprise in the country. The

annual return to civil life of thousands who have completed their enlistments, with their views of life settled, to become successful citizens is a superb testimonial to the efficiency of the machine, as well as are the thousands who are so inspired by the life as to take up the duty of a soldier as their vocation.

A few years ago we reached across the seas and assumed responsibilities in insular possessions and alien races. In the interest of advancing civilization we have built the Panama Canal. We have given a fiat to the world that on this hemisphere at least must survive the principle that rulers derive their just powers from the consent of the ruled. We claim an enlightened civilization of over a hundred million people and stand the richest country in the world. As a nation we are devoted to the peaceful avocations of industrial and commercial life. We treat others as we desire to be treated. Few have knowledge of war and fewer still any training for its rigors. We are entering fully into the affairs of the world and as the greatest of nations we must be ready to uphold and protect our institutions.

It is fundamental with a free people that equal opportunities and protection under the law brings equal responsibility in upholding and maintaining the law. Each owes to the body politic his duty not only in civil affairs but also in the defense of the nation. But with us, thousands have been inculcated with the belief that wars were to be ended and that the United States should, as the exponent of the highest civilization, set an example in a minimum of military preparedness, and some even advocated the Army and Navy be disbanded. The country became apathetic in the training of its people for national defense. But the awful cauldron of war into which Europe was suddenly plunged has served to awaken us in a measure to a realization that we must believe in ourselves, and as the exponents of a democracy that should regenerate the political systems of the world, we must be ready to hold our place in the councils of the world, and to do this we must be physically fit or we shall be brushed aside by the vigorous manhood of other races who sacrifice self that the nation may live.

During the months of May and June hundreds of thousands marched in so-called preparedness parades to the plaudits of onlookers. But when the militia was called out in June to protect our border, it was with the utmost difficulty that its units were recruited to the small number required, and some were never filled. The spirit was rife to let somebody else do it. Not only is there evidence of the volunteer spirit being moribund, but the states have for years been unable to make an efficient showing with the militia, even with the generous assistance of the General Government in qualified instructors and supplies. It would seem that the self-reliance of the individual, like that of the states, had given way to dependence upon others. The fine volunteer spirit of the states' militia was injured in the demand for Federal pay

in time of peace. It sounded the knell of patriotic military training for individuals and commercialized the highest duty that a State can demand from its people. We have fallen away from the teaching of the fathers, for there is no longer instilled into our people the fundamental doctrine that every man owes a military as well as a civil obligation to his Government.

A young man between 18 and 21 is at the least earning capacity of his career. It is a time of anxiety to the parent and uncertainty for the son. During these years few settle into their life's vocation. They are an expense to their parents; their average earnings will not pay for their board and clothes. They can be given military training without the slightest disruption of business. The stabilizing effect of military discipline and intensive training upon such young men would be of utmost value in forming character and thereby a foundation for their life's work. They would become an asset of incalculable value to the nation, not only in time of emergency, but in the recruitment to industrial life of the thousands returned from military pursuits improved mentally, morally, and physically by the training. The hundreds of military schools in the country are evidence of the faith of thousands of parents that their boys are better fitted for the responsibilities of life by the elementary discipline and drills therein received. The most important function of our regular establishment should be to make it a real training school for our young men, and thereby inspire them with the spirit of patriotism and sense of duty and responsibility with which each generation must be imbued if we are to continue our high mission as a nation.

I shall not attempt in this report to evolve a system to carry out so important a work. It is believed that the average parent would gladly welcome the opportunity for military training for their boys between the ages of 18 and 21. As the training would be educational, there should be no remuneration for service, but the Government should stand all the expense.

If we are to continue to compete with the wage of labor for our soldiers, the cost will be enormous if we are to get the men. We hire police, we hire firemen, but there is a repugnance to the idea that we must continue to commit ourselves to no military resource other than that of hiring citizens to accept military training and to commit our future to such inadequate defense.

The justice of, as well as the necessity for, universal training is recognized in section 79 of the national defense act, which prescribes that *in time of war* "if for any reason there shall not be enough voluntary enlistments to keep the reserve battalions at the prescribed strength, a sufficient number of the unorganized militia shall be drafted into the service of the United States to maintain each such battalion at the proper strength." This provision is intended to keep the National

Guard units that have been sent into the field at war strength and is one of the best provisions regarding the National Guard in the bill. What I am contending for is that the principle recognized as applying to time of war should apply equally to time of peace, so that all of the youth of the country who are physically qualified for military service should be given thorough military training and discipline under competent officers and noncommissioned officers, so that on the outbreak of war they will be able without much additional training to render efficient service. To send men into battle who have not been given this thorough training and discipline is not only a useless waste of our resources in men, but, to any one who understands anything of the realities of modern war, convicts the people of the country who are responsible for such proceeding of criminal neglect.

A PLEA FOR UNIVERSAL SERVICE

Lieutenant-Commander John P. Jackson, U. S. N. (From Pamphlet of same title issued by the Conference Committee on National Preparedness.)

General conscription is, from the point of view of the seeker after efficiency, the only logical way to develop the full strength of the nation. He reasons that it is absurd to leave to the whim of the individual whether he will undergo military training of not. Every male must be brought up in the knowledge that he owes his services to the State, and that this takes precedence over even family ties. He should not escape military service except by reason of physical unfitness. This obligation is so thoroughly ingrained into the people of France and Germany that their tour of military service is performed as naturally as the ordinary occupations by which they earn their daily bread. When military service becomes as much a part of the life of a nation as this, three-fourths of its supposed hardships disappear. It is counted on, and the nation regulates its life accordingly.

Only in nations where this system does not exist and has not become a part of the life of its people is military service regarded as an irksome and unwarranted exaction on the part of the government, and an infringement upon the liberty of the individual. Such is tradition and custom! The people of nations who do not live under the constant threat of invasion by aggressive neighbors do not see the necessity of military service nor admit the obligation to serve. Those who do, can see the need and accept it without protest. But conditions change; science and invention bridge space, and nations which were once remote from the turmoil of the world's battle-fields suddenly find themselves within the reach of vast hostile armaments. Then must the traditions of the people readjust themselves to the conditions. . . .

The American character has also deteriorated in the last generation. We have lost the stamina and rugged vigor for which the founders of this republic were famed. Decades of peace and immunity from the hardships of war have weakened the spirit and softened the fiber of the American people. Years of prosperity have sapped their virility in the same manner as that of the ancient Romans. As the English were contemptuously termed by Napoleon a nation of shopkeepers, so may we be aptly called a nation of business men, and seekers after wealth, ease, and pleasure. We have forgotten the ideals of our ancestors, who fought and bled for the blessings of freedom. They appreciated the value of that for which their great sacrifices were made, and were ever ready to fight in its defense. Our generations, born under these blessings, accept them as matters of course, and as the normal state of affairs. We do not know the conditions under which the oppressed peoples of half the world live, and on account of which immigrants flock to our shores by the million. There is no disoposition, as of old, to fight for ideals.

What a benefit it would be to the individual and to the stock of the race if the manhood of the country were brought up to a higher level of physical and moral fitness! Once taught proper methods and having experienced the benefits of regular life and systematic exercise, our men in the majority of cases would continue to apply what they had learned and keep themselves fit. It would constitute a veritable revitalizing of the nation. The discipline and regularity of a soldier's life engendered by universal training would make for better citizenship and stronger and finer manhood. Every recruit would go forth better fitted for the vocations of civil life, and better able to take his place in the civil community as a public-spirited and valuable citizen.

G. R. DORSEY

Ohio State University in Debate against Cornell University. (University Debaters' Annual 1916-17, pp. 64-66.)

Throughout our history, voluntaryism has failed to give enough men. In the Revolution, our volunteer army declined from 89,000 to 29,000. At the same time the British force increased from 20,000 to 42,000, and historians say that only the French regulars saved us from ruin.

In the war of 1812, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Vermont refused to supply their quota of troops. In the rebellion, drafts had to be resorted to, when bounties of $600 did not secure enough recruits. Our call for volunteers in the Spanish-American War was never answered. After the raid at Columbus, New Mexico, last year the War Department called for 20,000 volunteers to bring the army up to its authorized strength, and in six weeks of intensive recruiting only 4,000 were

secured. Right now, when we are facing war with Germany, and have been doing so for two years, we cannot recruit even our present small army to its authorized strength.

The second fatal defect of voluntaryism lies in this circumstance, that while it does not train men in advance of war, the onrush of modern hostilities is so swift that we cannot prepare after war has begun. In the present struggle Germany poured a million and a half men across her border in one week. That is the way universal service nations act. England with volunteer service was not ready, and has required two years to get ready. France, however, with universal service, was able to mobilize her trained millions at once, and she stemmed the tide of Germanic power. Could she have done this with any volunteer or partial conscription plan? The answer is found in the records of our own mobilization on the Mexican border. Our volunteer militia had to spend months in camp training to get ready to begin to pursue a Mexican bandit.

Why was the neutrality of Switzerland respected? Because she had universal service, which enabled her to mobilize 400,000 trained men in two and one-half days. Belgium, on the other hand, disdained universal service and the million men it would have given her. She put her faith in voluntaryism, and we all know the result. Voluntaryism means preparation after war has begun, and that means defeat.

The third fatal defect of voluntaryism and partial conscription is the enormous and needless loss of life which it imposes on the untrained recruits. In the Civil War four times as many volunteers died of disease as died of bullets. In the Spanish-American War fourteen times as many volunteers died of disease as of bullets. This high mortality was absolutely inexcusable, because in the Russian war only one-fourth as many died of disease as died on the battle-field. Universal training had prepared the Japanese in advance to take care of themselves.

THE BASIS FOR NATIONAL MILITARY TRAINING

Henry L. Stimson. (From Pamphlet of same title issued by the National Security League.)

From the standpoint of our military history there is no more clearly established fact than the failure of the volunteer system. The United States have not yet warred with a first-class power free to devote its entire attention to them. Nevertheless, in our wars the system has regularly broken down. The leading states of Massachusetts and Virginia were forced to resort to the draft by 1777, or only two years after the opening of the Revolution. During the course of the war, in spite of such sporadic efforts by different states, the patriot armies shrunk in number from 89,000 in 1776 to 29,000 in 1781, and our cause was only

saved from failure by the timely intervention of the French fleet and army. In 1812 the volunteer system broke down in so many and varied ways as to make that war the most conspicuous example in our history of how to carry on military operations. During the Civil War both sides were forced to use the draft—the South within a year and the North shortly thereafter. Even in our little war with Spain the full quota of volunteers called for by the President was never obtained. The failure last summer of recruits to appear when called for by the President to meet a national emergency, although over a million citizens were parading and shouting themselves hoarse for preparedness, is merely the latest incident of what has been a practically unbroken record in our history.

Simultaneously with these events at home, war abroad has developed along lines which make the volunteer system more impossible than ever before. Prior to the development of modern democracies, campaigns were carried on by professional armies of limited size. The monarch called to his standard men with a natural taste for adventure, and they fought as the selected champions of a nation whose remaining citizens were otherwise engaged. The modern army has gradually grown to include the entire nation. Every citizen is either in the fighting line or at work directly supporting the military operations. In this fact lies one of the most vital changes in world development which has come with modern ideals and modern times. It represents not a recession into militarism but an advance in nationalism and democracy. It has been simultaneous with the growth of interest which the entire people take in the affairs of government. The work of the army is no longer regarded as the work of a sovereign but as the work of a nation, and one citizen feels aggrieved if he is asked to do a national duty which his fellow-citizen escapes. Thus the adoption of universal military training and service has not been confined to nations with aggressive ambitions or dangerous neighbors. It has occurred simultaneously in free republics, like Switzerland, France, Argentina, and Chili, and in constitutional monarchies, like Norway and Sweden. It represents the steady growth of an ideal in justice and fair play, namely, that he who has a voice in the selection of his own government is bound in honor to defend that government. It also indicates a recognition of the fact that there is a great difference between compulsion to serve a sovereign and compulsion to serve a commonwealth, and that in the latter case such action represents the deliberate voluntary choice of the people themselves. The slowness with which this democratic ideal has been realized by the English-speaking countries is due at once to their conservation of character and the fact that both England and America have hitherto developed their institutions in comparative isolation and freedom from national danger. It is now nearly nine centuries since England has suffered from a successful foreign invasion; the military

views and policies embodied in the Bill of Rights date back to a time when standing armies were composed of professionals and when England's geographical isolation was very different from today. Several years ago the great English-speaking commonwealth of Australia, in the face of assumed danger from the Orient, adopted universal obligatory training,* and, now that the changed world conditions have been brought home to her population by the war, Great Britain has at last abandoned the volunteer system and adopted conscription.

There can be no more curious inversion of fact than the fear that universal military training makes nations more likely to go to war. Such training has, on the contrary, been the very means by which the professional soldier—the man who spends his life in planning and thinking about war—is reduced to the lowest possible number in the community. Under the old system such professionals constituted the entire army, and their presence in the nation constituted a disturbing element at variance with those of their fellow-citizens. Under the new system their place is taken by men who learn the art of national defense as part of their regular education, and then, after the period of training is over, at once become merged in the general citizenship of the nation. These men thereafter have no special leaning toward war. Their subsequent ties, habits, and ambitions lead in the same peaceful direction as those of their fellow-citizens. It is just as much of a personal wrench for them to pull themselves loose and go to war as for men who have not been trained, and the effect of their training is to make more vivid to them the dangers and discomforts of warfare. Under the new system the only body of professional soldiers left in the nation is the comparatively small group of officers and noncommissioned officers who perform the function of instructors to the others. Whether such a nucleus can become a source of militarism in a nation or not depends far more upon the attitude of the nation toward that nucleus than on any other consideration. If they are treated as a privileged and ruling caste, as in Germany, the danger may become real; if, on the contrary, they live constantly under the Anglo-Saxon tradition that the military authority is ever subject to the civil, as here, the danger, in my opinion, is wholly imaginary. Certainly there is no class of our present citizenship of my acquaintance which maintains more consistently and intelligently, in thought and behavior, the traditions of our free institutions than the officers of our Regular Army.

As a matter of fact, there are, in the case of the American Republic, special and peculiar reasons for the institution of universal military training which do not exist in other democracies. In the first place,

---

*Universal obligatory training and service for the purpose of Australian home defense has been in force in that commonwealth since 1911. The conscription bill which was defeated in the autumn of 1916 went farther and provided that Australians might be drafted to serve in Europe.

there has been pouring in upon us, during the past half-century of our national life, a great stream of immigration, composed of men who have never had the lesson in loyalty to American institutions which was instilled into our fathers by the wars, the privations, and the common experiences of our national growth. Many of these have come here not to assume but to escape national duty; many of them have come with a very imperfect appreciation of any responsibility toward the State, let alone the duty of sleepless vigilance required for the preservation of liberty. Of late we have had ugly revelations of the imperfect way in which our existing institutions have performed the duty of assimilating these immigrants. No better way could be found to bring home to these men and their children the fact that free government has responsibilities as well as privileges, or to amalgamate them into our present population, than to have them learn, shoulder to shoulder with our native-born youth, the duty of defense of the flag.

Nor would the lesson come amiss to the native-born. Under whatever test, we are a lawless nation. The murder rate of New York is double that of Paris, triple that of Berlin, and more than seven times that of London. Most other large American cities have a far higher murder rate than New York. Memphis multiplies it by nine. Crime in general is seven times more prevalent today in this country in proportion to the population than it was sixty years ago.* What a lurid light these figures cast upon the fear sometimes expressed lest a little military training would destroy the freedom or the initiative of the American! Practice for six months in the rapidly decaying art of obedience would teach our undisciplined youth more than was useful toward the self-control which is essential to leadership among men than almost any other education.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

HON. EDMUND PLATT

. . . Every male citizen has three duties to his country: First, his education, compulsory without pay; second, his military service, compulsory without pay; third, to vote, compulsory without pay. These are not privileges or rights but duties. Being physically fit, unless he fulfills these three obligations he fails absolutely in his duty as a loyal citizen.

*"Causes and Cures of Crime," by Thos. Speed Mosley, St. Louis, 1913, p. 3; "Universal Military Training," by Lucian Howe, p. 103, authorities cited.

G. R. DORSEY

Ohio State University in Debate against Cornell University; University Debaters' Annual 1916-17, p. 72.

Our plan of universal service is pictured as undemocratic. Our opponents choose to compare the democracy of our plan to the democracy which would underlie the law that each person should wear a green coat. Gentlemen, there is no comparison between a system of universal military service and green coats. If you will agree with me that our system of taxation is democratic, then you must also admit that universal service is democratic for they are based upon the same principle. In every organization there are a few fundamental duties that must rest equally upon each individual. I ask you if our national defense is not such a fundamental duty?

Neither is universal military service unjust, as our opponents try to point out. In fact any system short of universal service is the really unjust one. Let us take a simple illustration. Farmer Brown's son has had two years of military training. Neighbor Smith's boy never had such training. The nation becomes involved in war, and calls for volunteers. Both boys respond to the call. Farmer Brown's boy understands army life and the art of war, and therefore has a great advantage over neighbor Smith's boy. Brown's boy knows from experience how to care for and protect himself. After the war he comes safely home. Smith's boy knows nothing of self-protection and defense. Long before the war is over he is destined never to return. I ask you whether justice has been rendered in each case? Would their scheme which causes unequal chances for life not be far the more unjust?

Moreover, I maintain that according to their system a great many lives would be needlessly sacrificed. Scores would have to pay the price of ignorance, where if they had had some training they might easily have been spared. Shall we even consider a scheme which is so obviously unjust and murderous. Friends, our manhood is too precious to have it ruthlessly slain as the price of ignorance. Universal military service would protect our fields, our homes; it would be just to every individual; it would not allow useless slaughter on the field of battle. These are facts. Therefore, let us adopt universal military service.

UNIVERSAL OBLIGATORY MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE
A CATECHISM

By GEORGE R. CONROY. (Selected from Pamphlet of same title issued by the National Security League.)

Q. What is meant by "Universal Obligatory Military Training and Service"?

A. A national system of compulsory instruction and training, carried on under federal supervision, which

1. Aims to make every normal male citizen a trained and disciplined soldier—physically, mentally and morally fit and ready to fight *effectively* for his country; and
2. Requires of every such citizen, within certain age limits, very brief yearly periods of military training in time of peace and instant response to any call for service in his country's defense.

Q. Is this kind of military training and service based upon a new idea in this country?

A. No. It is simply a logical, common-sense development of the plan of national defense laid down by the framers of our Constitution.

Q. Has it been tried anywhere in the world long enough to prove its worth?

A. Yes. It has been in effect in the democratic republic of Switzerland with the greatest success since 1848, and in Australia since 1909.

Q. Would it have any other result in this country than to build up a great citizen soldiery and guarantee our security against foreign aggression?

A. Yes. As part of our educational system, the purpose of which is to bring out the best there is in each individual and to make that best of greatest service to society, universal military training would be of inestimable value to the nation.

Q. In what way?

A. It would instill into our boys the qualities of obedience and discipline, which are just as necessary in civil as in military life; it would arouse and keep alive the true spirit of patriotism, by making all men realize the obligations as well as the privileges of citizenship; it would promote democracy, by recognizing no class distinctions in the training, disciplining, organizing, and service of the great citizen army of defense; and it would make a nation of virile, healthy, clean-living, clear-thinking, justice-loving men, prepared not only to maintain peace and promote prosperity and morality at home, but to do their whole part in the service of mankind and in hastening that day of practical universal brotherhood which we all hope is to come. . . .

. . . *Q. What are the essential features of the Australian military system?*

A. In Australia every boy between the ages of 12 and 18 is compelled to undergo military instruction along with his other studies. When

he reaches the age of 19 the Australian youth is a trained soldier and is then enrolled for a period of eight years in the battalion of the region in which he lives. During the period of his enrollment the Australian soldier is at all times liable for service in defense of his country, but when there is no call for such defensive service he is required to devote *only two weeks each year* to the practice of arms. . . .

. . . *Q. How many males reach the age of twenty each year in the United States?*

A. About one million.

Q. What percentage of these would be fit for military service?

A. At least 65 per cent, assuming, of course, that we had compulsory military training.

Q. So that eventually the United States, under the proposed system, would have an active army and a reserve of how many men?

A. It would have an active army of 2,500,000 men under twenty-four years of age, and a reserve of nearly 8,000,000 trained soldiers between the ages of twenty-four and forty-five who could be called to the colors in case of a long war. In other words, universal obligatory military training and service would result in giving us such an immense army and reserve of thoroughly trained men that no nation or combination of nations would dare to attack us, or to interfere with the rights of our citizens on land or on sea. . . .

. . . *Q. Has there been any recent demonstration of the value to Switzerland of her system of military training?*

A. Yes, the most convincing possible. On the day that war was declared by France and Germany, the citizen soldiers of Switzerland were engaged in the peaceful occupations of civil life. Twenty-four hours later that little republic, with a population only about 100,000 greater than the population of Massachusetts, had 150,000 trained warriors upon her borders, fully equipped and organized for defense, and 300,000 reinforcements on the march. This wonderful demonstration of preparedness, which has enabled Switzerland to remain at peace while war wages all around her, was made possible solely by her system of military training and service.

Q. What reason is there to believe that had Switzerland been less well prepared for defense she would have been dragged into the war?

A. The fate of the little unprepared nations, similarly situated, proves that Switzerland's ability to maintain her rights by force of arms is all that enabled her to remain neutral in the world struggle. Frederick A. Kuenzli, assistant appraiser of the port of New York, and formerly a lieutenant in the Swiss army, made this clear in a recent address, when he said:

> "Why did not Germany strike at France through Switzerland instead of through unprepared Belgium and defenseless Luxembourg? What prevented France and Italy from invading Germany at her most undefended frontiers through Switzer-

land? To both questions the answer is the same: The big powers knew how tremendous an obstacle the well-drilled and equipped, efficient, patriotic Swiss army manning the well-nigh impregnable fortification of Switzerland would be to any invasion conducted through her territory."

Q. Has the worth of the Australian system of preparedness been similarly tested?

A. According to Hon. William H. Hughes, prime minister of Australia, that Commonwealth would have been of comparatively little assistance to England in her present struggle had it not been for universal compulsory military training. In an address at Ottawa, Canada, February 19, 1916, Mr. Hughes said:

> "Australia has been able to do what she has done because we have adopted as the corner-stone of our democratic edifice the system of compulsory military training. . . To this we owe the complex and widespread organization for training officers, noncommissioned officers, manufacturing small arms, ammunition, clothing, and so on, without which we should have been almost helpless in this great struggle." . . .

Q. What is meant by the term "militarism"?

A. The term is now used almost wholly in reference to the policy of maintaining great standing armies, not simply for purposes of defense, but equally for purposes of conquest. Militarism, however, involves the establishment of a military caste which is socially superior to any other class in the community and which is not amenable to the rules of conduct laid down for the civilian.

Q. Does militarism rest upon the doctrine that "might makes right"?

A. It does. It believes that the strong should rule the weak and that any nation is justified in seizing what it has the power to seize and holding all it has the power to hold.

Q. Does the maintenance of a great standing army necessarily mean militarism?

A. Yes. In theory it is possible to have a great standing army without danger of militarism, but in practice the great standing army and militarism go hand in hand.

Q. How can that be?

A. Militarism means a desire for conquest, a desire to dominate. It places an undue emphasis upon military achievement and military glory. It believes with Bernhardi that "war is a biological necessity of the first importance, a regulative element in the life of mankind that cannot be dispensed with." In other words, militarism is a national spirit, and the great standing army is merely the instrument through which it must act. Therefore, while in theory a nation might maintain a great standing army for purely defensive purposes, as a guarantee of peace and not because of a desire for war or conquest, as a matter of fact the great standing army, being the essential instrument of

effective militarism, is consequently the product of militarism and is not likely to be tolerated in any country in which the spirit of conquest does not exist. Universal military training renders a large and costly standing army unnecessary. . . .

. . . *Q. Why does the National Security League contend that the United States can never be adequately prepared for defense without a great citizen soldiery developed under a system of universal obligatory military training and service?*

A. Because the only conceivable alternative is impracticable, if not utterly impossible.

Q. What is that alternative?

A. The creation and maintenance of a navy powerful enough to prevent the landing of hostile forces at any point upon our thousands of miles of coast line, or the creation and maintenance of a standing army large enough to combat the enemy forces which, in the absence of such a navy, could easily be landed upon our shores by any first-class power.

Q. Why is the creation and maintenance of either of those forces regarded as impracticable?

A. A navy which could be depended upon to secure us against invasion would have to compare in power with that now possessed by Great Britain. It has taken England centuries to arrive at her present naval power, and the construction of such a navy by the United States would not only take so many years that it might be useless when completed by reason of changing methods of warfare, but would entail an intolerable tax burden upon the American people. We need a navy very much more powerful than that we now possess, but public sentiment would never tolerate a navy large enough to render us absolutely safe against attack. As for an army of the size mentioned, it would be impracticable for these reasons:

1. It would savor of militarism, and therefore would constitute a complete reversal of our national policy and be entirely out of harmony with our traditions and ideals.
2. It would impose an unwarranted burden of expense upon the people and result in an incalculable economic loss to the nation.
3. Public sentiment is, and very likely always will be, opposed to such an army, not only for the reasons stated, but because its maintenance would be considered a reversion to autocratic military ideals; wherefore, Congress would not dare to authorize it, and if authorized, it could not be recruited.

Q. Why could it not be recruited?

A. Because the spirit of militarism is utterly lacking in our people, and because, while the American soldier receives higher pay than the soldier of any other nation, so small is this pay compared with the earning power of the average American in civil life that comparatively few desirable men feel called upon to make the sacrifice of enlistment.

Q. Is that statement based upon experience?

A. Yes; it is confirmed by our whole military history. The record shows that, excepting possibly the higher places in the service, arms as a profession does not appeal to the average American. He does not like the life. To get men to fill the ranks has always been difficult, and it is a matter of common knowledge that even under the stress of excitement on the Mexican border the effort to increase our present inadequate army has been anything but successful. . . .

. . . *Q. Would the creation of a citizen army under universal military training make it unnecessary to maintain even a small standing army?*

A. No; in the words of Mr. Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of War, "we shall always need a *small* regular army, not only to serve as a nucleus and training corps for our citizens, but to be what we call our first line or emergency defense, both against internal disorder and against invasion, and also to perform the expeditionary service occasion for which, in our development as a great power in the world, has become increasingly frequent."

Q. Is this in accordance with our national policy?

A. Yes; it has always been the policy of the United States to depend upon both classes of soldiers—those who make military service their regular work in peace as well as in war, and those who are called for service only in case of emergency or war.

Q. So that our policy in this respect would not be changed under the proposed system?

A. No. The only difference would be one of *efficiency*. Under universal military training our citizens would go to the front, if called, *absolutely fit*—every man at least as good a fighting unit as any soldier in the world; whereas, under our present volunteer system, our citizens are sent to meet the enemy in a state of unfitness that constitutes nothing short of criminal negligence on the part of the nation. Furthermore, under the proposed system, an army of *millions of fit men* could be mobilized in a fraction of the time that it now takes to mobilize an army of *thousands of unfit men*. In case of trouble with a first-class power, the difference would mean THE LIFE OF THE NATION. . . .

. . . *Q. What authority is there for the statement that a military system based upon universal obligatory training and service is democratic?*

A. In the first place, there is an authority of history. Switzerland has had universal obligatory military training and service for nearly seventy years. Switzerland has been a republic for six hundred years, and the Swiss people stand, like ourselves, as the guardians of liberty and as living examples of the success of orderly self-government. We have also the authority of common sense. Thomas Jefferson, the patron saint of democracy, was a persistent advocate of universal obligatory

military training, and Madison and Monroe expressed similar sentiments. Indeed, it is clear from their utterances that most of our great men of the past, from Washington down, had universal military training and service in mind, and history shows that if their counsel had been followed this nation would have been saved the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of lives and untold millions of money.

Q. Have some of our present-day leaders testified to the democracy of universal obligatory training and service?

A. Yes, many of them, including Samuel Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor; Theodore Roosevelt, Robert Bacon, former Secretary of State; Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War; Alton B. Parker, Joseph H. Choate, and others of equal prominence in the life of the nation.

Q. What is the testimony of common sense as to the democracy of the proposed system?

A. Democracy means equality of obligation, as well as of rights and opportunities, and common sense tells us that we cannot have such equality when the burden of defending their common country does not fall equally upon all the people, rich and poor, high and low, alike, or when class and "pull" are recognized in the organization of the nation's military forces. It tells us, furthermore, that under universal obligatory military training and service the people will control their army just as they control their government; that no man, whatever his standing in civil life, will be allowed to shirk his duty as a soldier, and that the place of every man in the military organization will be determined by merit and by nothing else. . . .

. . . *Q. Would a national defense system based upon universal obligatory military training and service increase the liability of the individual citizen to serve as a soldier in case of war?*

A. It would *not*. Our Government now has power—a power which was exercised during the Civil War—to compel every citizen to take up arms and fight for this country, *but it is under no obligation to prepare him for such dangerous and exacting service.*

Q. Is that just?

A. On the contrary, it is *the essence of injustice.* General Henry Lee, a distinguished Revolutionary officer, epitomized the matter admirably when he said:

> *"A government is the murderer of its citizens which sends them to the field uninformed and untaught, where they are to meet men of the same age and strength, mechanized by education and disciplined for battle."*

Q. A system of obligatory training, then, would simply require the Government to compel its citizens to train for the performance of a duty which they are now obliged to perform whether trained or not?

A. Exactly.

Q. But isn't it unjust to compel the citizen to train for a duty which he might be willing to perform, if left to himself, without preliminary training?

A. No more unjust than it is to compel him to go to school when a boy, or to compel him to do jury duty and pay taxes, and all these things are compulsory under our system of government. It must be remembered that government is organized, not for the benefit of the individual, but for the benefit of the community; and whenever the desires of the individual run counter to the interests of the community, the individual must give way. But in this case there is no question of such a conflict, for it is equally for the benefit of the individual and the community that every citizen be trained to do his best in defense of himself, his family, and his nation.

Q. But, under our present system, will our citizens not volunteer for service in sufficiently large numbers, and will they not have time to prepare after hostilities have begun?

A. Rivers of blood have flowed and billions of treasure has been wasted in testimony of the utter failure of our volunteer system. Some men will volunteer and others will not, and it is unjust to those who volunteer to ask them to fight for those who are too unpatriotic or too cowardly to fight for themselves. Citizenship means service as well as rights, and no man is worthy to enjoy the rights of citizenship who is unwilling to prepare for effective service in defense of those rights. As for training after war has begun, Frederic L. Huidekoper, a great military authority, says that "adequate preparation for war has never yet in history been made after the beginning of hostilities without unnecessary slaughter, unjustifiable expense, and national peril," and every war in which this country has engaged is eloquent in proof of that assertion.

Q. There is as much justice, then, in obligatory military training as there is in obligatory education?

A. There is no difference. Military training *is* education—education of mind and body; and to make it compulsory in our public schools is merely to extend our educational system to include a branch of knowledge which is absolutely necessary as a matter of justice to the individual, to the family, and to the nation. . . .

. . . *Q. What is to be said of universal obligatory military training and service from the point of view of economy?*

A. It is impossible to measure the tremendous economic superiority of such a system over any other system known. Of course, the mere question of cost should not be a controlling factor in the adoption of a system of national defense, except where other things are equal, because what we must have is an *adequate* system, and whatever that costs is money well invested, while whatever may be the cost of anything short of adequacy is money wasted. In the case of universal obligatory mili-

tary training and service, however, we have the basis of a system which is not only *adequate* from a purely military point of view, but which is infinitely cheaper than any other system to create and to maintain, while in its effect in improving the health and promoting the industrial and general efficiency of the whole people, its ultimate value to the nation would be beyond computation. . . .

THE AMERICAN BLIND SPOT

H. C. Washburn. (From Pamphlet of same title, copyrighted and published by Doubleday, Page & Co.)

Every American citizen worth his salt should rejoice to have the *opportunity* to receive thorough training as a soldier or a sailor serving with the colors, provided, most especially, that *all other* able-bodied citizens, at a certain age, are called upon, even if it be by lot, to serve with the colors. This opportunity can be given to the poor man, or the man of limited means, only by a law establishing compulsory military training. Under such a law, his family must be provided for while he is in service, and his employer must be forced to continue his employment when he returns from service.

The only compulsion in universal training and service, speaking strictly and honestly, is a compulsion *to perform a duty already recognized*, and recognized in the statutes of the United States. To all truly patriotic citizens, then, it would not be compulsory. The word "compulsory" would apply, in their minds, to some one else, just as the criminal law applies to "some one else," and sends the criminal *by compulsion* to jail. . . .

The fact that "militarism" in some other country can be, or actually has been, *superimposed* upon the essentially democratic structure of compulsory military service, is no argument against it, for the simple reason that *only an autocracy* can thus superimpose militarism upon a people. If we are to determine the effect of compulsory service upon a nation, we must first ask ourselves an exceedingly important question: "Are we considering autocratic monarchies, or are we considering democracies?" In the case of the United States we are considering a democracy. We can argue, therefore, only on the basis of what compulsory service has done in other democracies—France, Switzerland, Australia. From this, the sole logical basis of reasoning, are we not forced to the conclusion that compulsory training and service are essentially democratic? . . .

In Washington's letter to Congress, written on September 15, 1780, he sounded the grave but unheeded warning which follows:

> *Regular* troops *alone* are equal to the exigencies of modern war, as well for *defense* as offense, and when a *substitute* is attempted it must prove *illusory* and *ruinous*. . . .

In the letters and state papers of Abraham Lincoln there is a document headed "Opinion on the Draft," and dated August 15, 1863. It proves, in words written by the heroic genius who has been called the greatest of all Americans, that our military policy failed in the greatest crisis through which our people have ever passed. Lincoln stated:

> They tell us that the law is unconstitutional. It is the first instance, I believe, in which the power of Congress to do a thing has ever been questioned in a case when the power is given by the Constitution in express terms. Whether a power can be implied when it is not expressed has often been the subject of controversy; but this is the first case in which the degree of effrontery has been ventured upon of denying a power which is plainly and distinctly written down in the Constitution. The Constitution declares that "The Congress shall have power . . . to raise and support armies." . . . The whole scope of the conscription act is "to raise and support armies." . . . *Shall we shrink from the necessary means to maintain our free government? . . . Are we degenerate? Has the manhood of our race run out? . . .*

If the national defect of vision concerning military affairs which afflicts Americans may be termed the blind spot, the *total* defect of vision which afflicts the "pacifists" may be called the purblind spot. Those who are besotted with this extraordinary mental twist have brought forward the following argument:

"Preparedness for war causes war." Stripped of nonessentials, this is their creed.

The reply to their argument is found in American history. We have never been thoroughly prepared for war except at one brief period—immediately after the Civil War. In 1865 the United States maintained in the field a *conscript* army of over 1,000,000 veterans, by all odds, at that time, *the most powerful army* in the world. In 1865 the United States maintained an immense navy, a navy mainly of iron-clads, which was by all odds *the most powerful navy* in the world.

Shortly after the Civil War, the United States was involved in *two* most *serious* controversies, one with Great Britain and the other with France, the two *most powerful* of foreign powers. The United States Government *demanded* that Great Britain agree to settle the *Alabama* claims. Great Britain agreed; there was no war about it. The United States Government *demanded* that France withdraw her troops from Mexico. France withdrew her troops from Mexico; there was no war about it. In other words, at the only period of our history when we were thoroughly prepared for war, when our army and navy both were the most formidable in the world, the United States forced two great

foreign nations to accede to its terms on two grave questions affecting our rights, *and entered upon the longest period of peace we have ever enjoyed*, a period of 33 years. This peace of 33 years, following our one period of preparedness, should be contrasted with the wars we have waged when we were in our "normal" state of *un*-preparedness.

SOME FACTS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Major-General Upton. (From Pamphlet with same title issued by The National Society for the Advancement of Patriotic Education.)

We hear arguments against preparedness on the grounds of militarism. Militarism is a state of mind. When a nation has reached the limit of its expansion, and competition becomes excessive, further expansion is essential and lust of conquest results. The United States today has nowhere even nearly touched the limit of its expansion, and we have no desire for conquest. While we have still unconquered our own resources it is impossible to become militaristic. We are too busy developing our own possibilities to think of conquering others.

Security is cheap at any price, but unpreparedness is the most expensive luxury in the world. Switzerland was prepared and is inviolate. Belgium was unprepared. Now look at it! Even assuming that preparedness costs half a billion this year—due to our previous negligence we are forced to make a spurt—if we consider it as a form of insurance and consider the capital and lives saved, it is a low rate of premium. As a business proposition, what would you think of a man who neglected to maintain his factory fire-proof if he knew it to be in a dangerous neighborhood and apt to catch fire, and when he knows that such a fire would result in the loss of life of many of his employees? What would be done to the directors of a company who deliberately shut their eyes to such a condition and allowed their factory to become a fire-trap and did nothing to prevent it? Congress today stands in the position of such a board of directors.

It is a peculiar frame of mind these anti-preparedness people have got themselves into. "The ocean is defense enough," and they forgot Gallipoli and Saloniki. "Preparedness brings on war," and they ignore China. "Our present system is good enough," and they overlook our history. "Our navy can't be licked." How about the fact that it was licked in the last maneuvers? "Preparedness is immoral." The Bible shows us time after time that preparedness against unjustifiable attack is not only moral, but also essential. And so they go. All have different reasons as to why preparedness is wrong, and the only thing which they seem to possess in common is an infinite ability to talk without a knowledge of facts. Preparedness is a business proposition for this country, and it simply means being far-sighted and unprejudiced enough to learn by our experience and current history.

GENERAL GEORGE W. GOETHALS

Every man owes a duty to his country which he should pay in part by personal service in time of need, and it is only fair to him that his country should so train him that if ever an emergency arises and he is called upon to serve he may do so in the most efficient manner and with the greatest economy of life. That is why I am in favor of the proposal for universal military training. This war has demonstrated one thing above all others: you cannot take men raw from the street and push them into battle. It would be nothing short of murder. So we must have military training.

Military training must be universal. Equality is the very life-breath of democracy. The absolute civil and political equality of all citizens is a cardinal principle of our republican form of government, and whatever duty one man owes is owed by all men alike. Whatever steps are taken to train our citizens for self-defense must apply to all—to the rich and to the poor, to the learned and to the ignorant, to the country boy and the town lads. All must have an equal chance. So military training must be universal.

Universal military training will do this for the United States: It will raise the moral and physical tone of the nation, it will develop the individual, it will create a sense of duty and responsibility, it will instill respect for lawful authority, and give birth to a feeling of nationalism instead of the feeling of sectionalism which still exists. Finally, by training the son of the millionaire alongside of the son of the laborer, it will make democracy a living thing.

ON YOUR OWN HEADS

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

One of the most astounding of untenable theories still held by Americans is that mere men, mere weight of numbers, can succeed in war. It is strange that after reading of England's training problem in the present war leading men in public life can still talk of the willing millions ready overnight or after a few weeks of training. Quite aside from the important little item that the necessary trainers do not exist, it is known as a fact proved by the experience of modern war that a year of work of preparing the average citizen is necessary before he can be sent to the front as an effective unit. It is not merely a question of drill, of the manual of arms, of the parade ground. Do we realize that not one American in a hundred knows how to take care of his own physical body under service conditions? Do we understand how very few of us can march twenty miles or dig a trench? Do we think we

can all hit a five-foot square target at six hundred yards (leaving out all question of the bull's eye)? Is there any reason to believe that Americans are as a whole physically better than the Germans or Russians or French? Of course, if some seer could assure us that in case of a great war we should have a year or so to prepare for it, we could continue on our happy-go-lucky course. That has not been the history of the way wars commence.

Today we see armies of millions, we see great military operations carried on thousands of miles away from the home country. Witness the British at Salonica, the Canadians in France, the Australians in Egypt. We can no longer hold a mere ocean a barrier to that power which controls its waters. In other words, we must admit that a great campaign in the Western Hemisphere, a campaign into which millions of men could be thrown, is a military possibility to any nation or combination of nations able to drive our fleet off the seas. In such a case we must be able to meet trained men with trained men—and overmatch them at their own game. . . .

Approach the question of national defense from any angle, examine the definition of war as it exists in 1917, enumerate world resources, count noses at home and abroad—whether looked at from the constitutional, from the democratic, or from the economic point of view there can be only one way of meeting attack with assured success, and that way lies in the training of every individual for the service of the nation in its need. The very word "training" presupposes work done now but to be applied to a future contingency. We do not educate engineers by asking them at once to build us an important bridge—that is, if we ever hope to cross that bridge ourselves. We send our boy to a school of engineering that his future work may safely endure. So, too, if the work is to be well done there must be true coöperation by every person employed on it. In Europe today every individual in the warring countries is taking part in the war; the conflict is not confined to the trenches or to the men: it reaches back to the railways, to the factories, to the homes, to the old men—to the women, yes, and to many of the children. We are not ready for a national coöperation of that kind. We lack the self-discipline; we lack, in fact, the remotest idea of what this national service would mean to us as individuals. We do not know where we would "fit in."

Certain professional peace theorists have with crafty cunning laid emphasis on the military feature of universal training. They have called up pictures of the omnipresent uniform, of the Cossack whip of olden days, of the military dictator. They forget that in a true republic, service which is universal is of necessity voluntary; it is, in other words, the desire of the majority of the people themselves. If there are shirkers, if there be any who would still place the liberty of the individual—their own little right to go their own gait—above

the liberty and the need and the safety of the community and of the nation, then in their case alone can universal training be called compulsory. Few of us honestly fear that this nation will ever become militaristic; the trend of our civilization is all the other way. Switzerland and Australia are examples of progressive democracy successfully armed against attack. And yet many of our prominent men have argued with me that our great size would preclude us from following these systems. They can understand training a hundred thousand men a year; they balk at half a million. They are the kind of people who would organize a well or two to supply a city block but who would be appalled at the thought of a municipal water system.

THE CHIEF ADVANTAGES OF PREPAREDNESS

By J. W. McEACHREN. (From a Pamphlet entitled: The Meaning or Preparedness Issued by the Universal Military Training League.)

To speak of the advantages of Preparedness would seem, at a casual glance, to be absurd and unnecessary, for practically every one will admit that preparedness has every possible advantage over unpreparedness.

We believe we stand clear of debatable ground when we say that preparedness is a condition due almost wholly to efficiency. The greater the degree of efficiency the higher the state of preparedness. Also, the larger the number of efficient individuals the higher the state of national preparedness. These are self-evident facts. . . .

The efficient man is one who does well—as well as it may be done—whatever he undertakes to do. He knows that he cannot do his best unless he takes into consideration everything that favors as well as retards his forward efforts. Thus he is frankly and broadly coöperative. Efficiency without coöperation is neither efficient nor coöperative. In fact, it is through coöperation and coöperation only that we can have the quality of efficiency that will assure national preparedness.

The first advantage to come from a general movement toward genuine national preparedness is an increasing body of efficiency and coöperation, a greater advance toward hearty and helpful "team-work." This broad, underlying, essential advantage carries with it all the other advantages, the chief of which may be grouped under the following heads:

Moral.
Mental.
Political.
Economical.

We place these classifications in the order of their highest value to humanity, while recognizing that in the practical working out of our necessarily slow progress toward completely efficient national prepared-

ness, the strong initial impulses, for the vast majority of us, will be economical ("bread and butter") before they begin passing through the increasing refinements of political, mental, and moral considerations. The higher advantages should be set down first, that we may not find ourselves content to stop at some lower level where the fleshpots simmer with abundance or material power and pomp offer their allurements. . . .

The moral advantages of a state of wholly efficient national preparedness are in total the working ideal of democracy. Efficiency that develops this condition, essentially through an ever-widening and humanizing coöperation, inevitably must teach us that understanding of the rights and privileges of others, and that quick sense of our own duties and obligations so inseparably interwoven with an enduring social and political fabric.

And, long before we have attained this ideal, efficiency will have taught us the value of good habits, of clean living, of honest thinking and acting, of square dealing with our fellows—in short, the objective of efficient progress is the practical living of the Golden Rule, that refined and perfected democracy in which every citizen shares equally the rights, privileges, opportunities, protection, duties, and obligations of efficient popular government.

The mental advantages of preparedness, being based on efficiency, will come most readily through a system of public and private education which recognizes not only that our schools should fit us for bread-winning, but also for the hours of leisure when a taste for good reading and practice in contemplation may make us companions of the great minds of days that have passed. Efficiency means thinking, and thinking requires a well-ordered mental process that comes through observation and reading and study. . . .

The political (including social) advantages under a continuing state of national preparedness may be said to be as numerous as our present political shortcomings. When we attain and maintain a condition of efficient national preparedness it need not surprise us to find that the political advantages are emphasized as the direct opposite of most of the prominent features of what we call politics today.

Being efficient individually and as a nation, we shall demand efficiency in those selected by us to conduct our public business. Having learned the high value of coöperation, we shall watch our law-makers closely to see that "special-privilege" legislation, "log-rolling" tactics, and purely sectional statutes do not destroy the smooth working of our higher policy—an injury to one is an injury to all—for advantaging one or a few in a democracy is injuring all others who do not share in the advantage.

Preparedness means more intelligent, more careful voting; better men in our councils, legislatures, and congress; better and more effi-

cient public officials of every sort; better and broader—which implies fewer—laws; greater economy in the conduct of public business; more equitable and more scientific methods of taxation; less friction and jealousy and envy between the political units of the nation—between city and city, between State and State; a clearer and higher conception of our social obligations and privileges because of our franker recognition of the rights and privileges of others. Preparedness means all of these, and many more, highly desirable things all tending to knit us into a more compact, more efficient and more influential nation.

Naturally the economical advantages of national preparedness will be enjoyed first. We are an industrial nation. The vast majority of us have to work for our living. We have small space anywhere in our busy life for drones and idlers. Already we have accepted efficiency as the basic requirement for successful industrial and commercial enterprises and activities. More and more is this efficiency showing itself in friendly and genuinely helpful coöperation. Never before in our history have we found it so easy to form influential groups of interests, more or less closely allied, for purposes of material advancement; never has there been so wide a recognition of the actual business (to say nothing of the ethical) value of honesty and squareness in our dealings with our fellows.

Preparedness—Which here most assuredly means efficiency—will bring us the most tangible returns on the business side of our national life. There will be less waste, more thrift, closer and friendlier cooperation between capital and labor, less unfair competition, and generally improved working and living conditions. There is scarcely a point in our vast industrial and commercial activities that will not yield compensating advantages for every effort we make to increase our individual and collective efficiency in the conduct of our business. And putting the business of the nation into condition that will make it ready for any demand that may be made upon it is the first great step toward that national preparedness which the emergency of a great war has found us so sadly lacking.

J. DUDLEY SEARS

Ohio State University in Debate against Cornell University. (University Debaters' Annual 1916-17, p. 70.)

Is the system of universal military service really expensive? If we compare the cost of maintaining one soldier in the United States with one in any of the nations of Europe where universal service is used, we find that ours is by far the most expensive. The volunteer system costs twice as much per man as the universal service. The average cost of training a soldier in the United States per year is $1,300. To support an army the size of Germany's would cost on the basis of our present army $750,000,000 per year. Compulsory service on the same basis would only cost $1,250,000.

JOHN BRICKER

Ohio State University in Debate against Cornell University. (University Debaters' Annual 1916-17, pp. 66-69.)

In the first place, universal military service is economically our best policy. At the beginning of this war it cost the Government $1,300 to maintain a soldier for one year. No country in the world having universal service was paying more than $350 per year. Every citizen of the United States was paying $3.10 to keep up our inefficient volunteer army of 100,000 men, while the German citizen was paying only $3.30 under the universal military system to maintain the most efficient army in the world, an army of 700,000 men.

Now this extreme difference in cost goes to the very nature of the two systems, for a voluntary army is based upon a money consideration while a universal army is founded upon a public-service consideration. Long before the gentlemen of the Negative could raise the required number of men by increasing wages voluntary service would become far more expensive than our universal plan.

It is our plan to train the youth at a time when his occupation is not fixed and he is not in a position of responsibility. At 18 or 19 years of age he has neither family nor business dependent upon his services. But at the beginning of this war there were according to the report of the Industrial Commission 500,000 unemployed men in the United States, and even now, in this day of unemployed prosperity, there are 300,000 men out of work. They are consuming but not producing. There are as many as we would have in a universal army. Take these young men and let them serve in the defense of their country, and their places in industry would be filled by these unemployed men, there would be no economic loss from idleness, and every one would be benefited. If war were to be hurled upon us universal service would be financially our best policy. The Government would have enough men, and would know where they belong, for they would be trained. In this way time and expense would be saved in mobilization. Furthermore, the Government, by having enough men, could exempt from war service the best business men, the skilled mechanic, the leading farmers, for they would mean more to the Government at home in productive industry than on the battle-field.

Therefore, we see that under universal service, industry would not break down nor would production be curtailed, as is true under voluntary service, where the most efficient and patriotic are the first to enlist and the first to be killed.

This result is conclusively shown by the fact that Germany, completely blockaded, facing an unequal foe, has fed her own soldiers from her own soil, and in this time has perfected and produced the most deadly weapon of modern warfare—the German submarine; and uni-

versal service has made this possible. In contrast to this, we see England, with her most efficient business men, her best producers, sent to the front by volunteer service, having to cry out to the United States for food, for arms, and for ammunition; and, finally, we have produced for her the war-wasp with which she can effectively combat the submarine. England's whole industrial and productive fabric has been torn down by voluntary service. Universal service is therefore our best financial policy: first, because it will provide an army adequate to our needs at less cost than an army under the volunteer system, and secondly, because there would be no economic loss from idleness, and finally, because in time of war it would not destroy the financial and industrial fabric of the country. . . .

We challenge the gentlemen of the Negative to show us an instance where, in a country approaching republicanism, universal service has created an undue or undesirable spirit of militarism. Universal service does not create a spirit of militarism but it gives expression to our ideals of democracy. It is just and equitable, benefiting all, and all should help to bear the burden. This Government protects the toiling citizen in his humble home the same as the wealthy man in his palace. Last summer the whole army was sent into Mexico to protect the citizens along the border, one of the fundamental basic reasons for the adoption of our Constitution. That constitution binds us all closely together in a social compact with common rights and obligations. The Government has assumed its obligation which gives us our rights of citizenship. Do we owe anything in return? Is there any mutuality in this contract of citizenship? Have all the citizens assumed their obligations which the Government has a right to demand? No, not until every man has borne his share of the duty to defend the nation.

The duty is equally upon all. But if war should come, you honorable judges have the right from a democratic standpoint to demand that your son has an equal chance with your neighbor's son. If your son is not trained and your neighbor's son is, your son does not know how to meet the conditions of war, he has not been built to withstand its hardships, and obviously does not stand an equal chance for life. I charge that it is murderous neglect for this Government to send its citizens into war upon such an unfair and undemocratic basis. You have a sacred right as an American citizen to demand equality, and voluntary service is a violation of that right. In time of peace, therefore, universal service places the burden of serving upon all citizens equally, and in time of war, it gives every man an equal chance by preparing all. Truly we of the Affirmative agree with Secretary of War Baker that this is essentially a democratic policy.

Finally universal service is thoroughly in accord with our principles of government. We have compulsory universal education, compulsory health and sanitation laws, and compulsory tax laws. The Government

compels the observance of these laws by the individual even at a sacrifice of time and money, and why? Because it is for the public good. The first speaker of the Affirmative has shown that universal service is necessary for our common defense and for the public good. I have shown you that one of the basic reasons for adopting our Constitution was to provide for the common defense. Therefore, universal service is not only in accord with our ideas of government but is an obligation under the Constitution. It is the highest duty of patriotism. To bear arms in defense of the nation is the supreme test of citizenship. The last question asked a foreigner seeking naturalization in this country is "Will you bear arms in defense of your adopted country?" We of the Affirmative maintain it is American to place that same acid test before every citizen and assure this Government, through universal service, that every citizen has made ready for that supreme demand and duty, and has in time of peace prepared for war. Our policy of universal service is therefore politically best because it tends away from militarism to democracy, and it is in thorough accord with our principles of government.

THE NEEDS OF OUR ARMY

From "Defenseless America," pp. 136-8, by Hudson Maxim, 1915

In this country, the ideas of the average individual concerning his obligations to the Government and the Government's obligations to him are vague and crude to the last degree. Conscription would largely remedy this by teaching duty to the Government.

The Government has exactly the same right to levy on the individual for military service as it has to tax him for anything else. Just as the Government has the right to tax the individual for financial support of the Government, so it has the right to tax the individual for military support of the Government. Conscription makes the Government and the individual partners for the common welfare. Few persons in this country consider themselves partners of the Government.

Perhaps the best system of preparing the youth and young men of a country for military service is that practiced in Switzerland. Switzerland is a typical democracy, and yet no country in the world has a more universal and efficient system of military training for its youth and young men.

After the conclusion of the war of 1870, Germany, guided by the iron will of Bismarck, divulged to Switzerland that the mailed fist had an itching palm for Swiss territory. Immediately an army of a hundred thousand Swiss mobilized on the frontier. They were the best-armed, the best-trained, and altogether the most efficient soldiers in Europe.

Every man of them could shoot to kill. They were the flower of the mountains. Bismarck concluded that the game was not worth the candle. If Switzerland had not been armed to the teeth and ready, that country today would be a part of Germany.

The Swiss have not the remotest idea of making an aggressive move on any neighboring country, but they hold themselves in perfect readiness to see to it that no other nation can find it profitable to make an aggressive move on Switzerland.

Switzerland makes her military training a part of her school system. The chubby, rosy-cheeked little Swiss boys are taught to play soldier with wooden imitation guns, and as they grow, the training later becomes more comprehensive, more exacting, more scientific, until finally the young men find real guns in their hands, find themselves commanded by and receiving instructions from real officers, and they are taught to shoot. When their school training is over, their military training and term of military service also are over. They are ready for civil life, but, too, they are ready at any moment for the call of their country from civil life to shoulder rifle and knapsack and go to the front.

This is the system that we should adopt in our country. It places no burden upon the schoolboy or the young man; on the contrary, it is a source of keen enjoyment, like any other manly game.

The beneficial psychological effect is simple: The youth is taught obedience, his powers of perception are quickened, his alertness increased, his physique greatly strengthened, his health benefited, and his personal habits governed by laws of temperance and hygiene, with the result that his efficiency for usefulness in all the business and affairs of civil life afterward is greatly enhanced. Thus, in Switzerland, the earning power of the population is increased out of all proportion to the cost for the training and maintenance of the entire army.

References---Negative

THE CURE-ALL OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE

By Oswald Garrison Villard. (From Pamphlet of same title issued by the American Union against Militarism.)

In the years to come, none of the many amazing phenomena of 1916 will, I am sure, cause greater wonderment than our recent discovery that universal military service is the cure-all for every one of our American ills. Do we wish to defend our country? We have but to adopt the system of training every boy to be a soldier, and the problem is solved. Do we wish to become industrially efficient? Then let us forget all about vocational training, but give every American a year under arms, and presto! we shall outdo Germany in scientific efficiency and management. Is our youth lawless and undisciplined? Universal compulsory service will end that once for all. Is our democracy halting? It is the tonic of a democratic army that we need in which all men shall pay for the privileges of citizenship by a year of preparation for poison gas and of learning how to murder other human beings. Our melting-pot is a failure? Then let us pour into it the iron of militarism, and it will fuse every element at once. Finally, if we need an American soul—and the war has suddenly taught us that this glorious country lacks a soul—it is the remedy of universal military service that is to supply our spiritual needs and give us the ability to feel as one, to think as one, to steer towards our destiny as of one mind, imperialistically.

But in one respect the Swiss system does set an admirable example to the United States: It allows no general to exist save after the declaration of war. Its highest officer is a colonel. No major-generals parade the country urging "preparedness"; no brigadiers bewail the terrible fate that will overtake Switzerland if her standing force is not doubled at once. Yet even in Switzerland, if report be true, there is an anti-army party, people who complain that their military business has become ominous ever since so many of the younger officers have been serving in the German army and become imbued with the spirit of the Prussian General Staff, just as, according to a prominent Australian, speaking in a public meeting in London a few months ago, the feeling against the conscription of boys was so intense in Australia that the law compelling this servitude would have been repealed had not the war come just when it did. Perhaps the fact that in fifteen years some 22,000 Australian boys have been punished for refusal to perform military service, or for minor infractions of discipline, a large proportion by jail sentences, may have had something to do with the growing feeling against it. As to its merits, there is the same difference

of military opinion in regard to its work as is to be found in regard to the value of our own military forces.

But let us grant for the sake of argument that there is solid worth in the Australian and Swiss systems and less militaristic danger than under any other. Would the same hold true with us? Australia is but a colony, unable to make war by itself, controlled and protected by the power of the mother country's fleet. Switzerland, by her geographical and ethnic situation and the scarcity of her numbers, cannot dream of wars of conquest. She is not a world power. She has no colonies, or oversea entanglements, or foreign alliances. How different is our situation! We have powerful military cliques, great aggregations of capital seeking outlet abroad and engineered by the same groups of privileged citizens who have been behind the Six-Power Chinese loan, who desire to exploit the Philippines for our own benefit, who have set up in Nicaragua a government upheld today only by American bayonets, who desire commercially to conquer the remainder of the hemisphere. We have seen outbursts of jingo passion of 1849 and 1898 marked by the stealing of other people's lands. The universal arming of the nation—what would it not mean in another such period of excitement under the rule of conscienceless and time-serving legislators or administrators, or by generals gone into politics, with eyes keen only for a nation's aggrandizement, and viewing every question from the standpoint of a soldier!

History shows us clearly what it all might mean. Leaving aside the fate of the ancient republics, should we not recall what happened to the new-born French Republic? The nation rushed to arms, and out of the hurly-burly emerged the imperial figure which became the scourge of Europe. Such was the sudden transformation of a nation that but a few years before was imbued with the spirit of liberty, fraternity, and equality, whose doctrine did permeate all Europe to its very lasting betterment. But this tide of good-will, this spirit of universal brotherhood, was conquered by the militaristic spirit and militarism until it became, not the great leavening, leveling influence it should have become, but a menace for all the world against which all the nations of Europe were compelled to unite. Now we Americans, of course, think that nothing of the kind can happen to us—that we merely seek peace and to defend our own. Is it utterly without significance that our most distinguished rear admiral goes up and down the country preaching that the American flag shall be carried at once to Cape Horn; that every republic to the south of us shall be conquered? Does it mean nothing that the Navy League demands that we shall take what they call "our rightful share of oversea trade" and seize upon land which has not already been preëmpted by other strong nations for colonies for the United States? Is it not true that we are already extending our government over the Caribbean by force of bayonets?

We have one hundred millions of people; we have neighbors on our borders whom we could easily crush if we chose. To the south of us a score of republics fear every military move we make. It is an historic fact that even before the war in Europe the menace of our rapidly growing fleet was urged in the Reichstag, in the British and Japanese parliaments, as the reason for further increase of their naval armaments. Any introduction of universal military servitude in the western world would send a chill over the entire American continent and be viewed with alarm by the rest of the world.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE AND DEMOCRACY

By George Nasmyth. (From Pamphlet of same title issued by the American Union against Militarism.)

. . . Those who believe that class distinctions can be broken down and democracy created by regimenting men into masses and forcing them to drill together, have missed the central idea of democracy which is based on the principle of voluntary coöperation, of equality of opportunity, and the abolition of caste privileges. Those who believe that democracy can be imposed from without by force, and point to the examples of France and Switzerland, should analyze the conditions in those countries more deeply. So soon as we penetrate below the surface we find in each of them a great conflict between the forces of militarism and democracy. This conflict rages in all countries where universal military service is established, and it has been revealed in all its bitterness by the vivid, lightning flashes of the Dreyfus affair in France, the Zabern incident in Germany, and the Ulster crisis in the British army—all parallel instances of successful struggles for the supremacy of the military over the civil powers of government. . . .

Everywhere militarism has been the most formidable enemy of democracy. For every million soldiers you must have at least 30,000 officers, and these 30,000 officers must make the military profession their life work. They must cultivate an iron will and a spirit of domination as essential elements of success, and necessarily they chafe with impatience at the discussions and restraints of democracy and the civil powers of government. Altogether they constitute a source of ever-present danger to the peace of a nation which is powerful enough to be a menace to the world.

If the break-down of civilization in Europe has anything to teach America, surely it is the danger of any increase in the forces or the philosophy of militarism.

Discipline

The second argument for universal military service is that it will promote discipline. It will teach obedience and respect for authority, it is urged, and these elements are greatly needed in American life. The trouble here is the kind of discipline which military service provides. It is a discipline enforced from without and breaks down as soon as the restraining force is removed. The whole object of military training is to secure instantaneous obedience without thought, to make a man a part of an automatic military machine so that if he is ordered to sink the Lusitania or destroy the city of Louvain, he will obey instantly and unquestioningly. Such unthinking obedience is far removed from that self-imposed discipline, that respect for laws, because they have been enacted by common consent and for the welfare of the people; of freedom of discussion, of speech, of press, of assembly, and of conscience, which are the foundation-stones of a self-governing democracy. At first, the German people opposed conscription bitterly, but after a few generations of men had been put through the military machine and taught the right kind of obedience all opposition ceased. Germany became a servile state.

National Unity

The third argument is that it will promote Americanism, it will heal all our divisions of race and nationality, eliminate the hyphen, and unify the American people.

The experience of European nations which have tried to meet similar problems by this method is in flat contradiction of such an assumption. The history of Poland, of the subject races and nationalities of Russia, and of Turkey is a refutation of the claim that national unity can be secured by universal military service.

America needs unity, a national consciousness, and a national will, but no reactionary, militaristic, obsolete, old-world instrument, such as conscription, can unify the American people.

Patriotism

A fourth argument for universal military service is that it will promote patriotism, it will teach a man to be ready to sacrifice himself for others and to lay down his life for his country in the service of a great idea. The difficulty with this plan is that there are various kinds of patriotism and the tendency of militarism is to emphasize the wrong kind—the patriotism which corresponds to a narrow nationalism and to kingoism and the patriotism which is based upon the hatred of other parts of the human race who happen to live the other side of a boundary line. Patriotism and nationalism of the wrong kind are defeating their

own ends in Europe. For the sake of our country, as well as for humanity, we must develop another type of patriotism than universal military service has given us in Germany or any of the European countries, a patriotism which will look upon America as a part of the world, and will take pride in the contributions which America can make to the family of nations.

We need greatly a rebirth of true patriotism, just as we need a more fundamental democracy, deeper national unity, more self-discipline; but universal military service is not the panacea for these ills. A true American patriotism can be created only by a return to the great principles of the founders of the Republic, a new vision of the mission of America in the world, a great world task such as the establishment of a League to Enforce Peace, calling for the sacrifice of old provincialisms and outworn traditions in the service of humanity as a whole. In this way, under the great constructive leadership of a world statesman, America can be unified. By these new paths, which lead out into a future full of hope and service, it may be that in the coming years the soul of America will be born again into a new and larger life, but never by the path of conscription, of fear and servile obedience, and the mechanical methods of militarism.

A much deeper principle is involved than is usually discussed in connection with universal military service: What kind of a society do we wish to live in? For, if the principle of compulsion is accepted in the case of military service, it must logically be accepted for service in munition factories, on the railroads, in coal mines, and in all the industrial and economic life upon which modern wars depend. In other words, once having granted the principle of compulsion on the ground of military necessity, all the fundamental principles of democracy must be sacrificed and our country must be "Prussianized" from within. Freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press are all opposed to military effectiveness, and must disappear step by step if freedom of conscience, the advance trench of democracy, is carried by the militarists; for, in the last analysis, universal military service means conscription of conscience.

America is the only great nation left in the world in which militarism is not enthroned and the principle of conscription established. In order to defend our institutions and our democracy from imaginary dangers from without, we are urged to surrender to this much more real and formidable enemy of militarism and conscription from within.

Some time in the future, if Europe remains an armed camp after this war, and if militarism is enthroned in the world, it may become inevitable for America to adopt conscription. But if conscription ever does become inevitable let us not add blasphemy to our other crimes by adopting militarism in the name of democracy. No, let us do it with the clear knowledge that we are dealing a death-blow to the

greatest experiment in democracy the human race has ever tried. Let us do it with the consciousness that we have participated in a great world tragedy, and that with the triumph of militarism in the New World as well as the Old, we shall have seen government of the people, by the people, and for the people, perish from the earth.

SHOULD THERE BE MILITARY TRAINING?

By LOUIS P. LOCHNER. (From Debaters' Handbook on Military Training, p. 146.)

. . . Still I would oppose it, particularly at this time of international unrest. In our modern state of inter-dependence, no nation any longer lives unto itself. Whatever is said or thought or done in one part of the universe becomes part of the world-thought or the world-mind. Even war among so-called civilized nations is no longer possible between two isolated countries, but, as we now learn by horrible example, has become so internationalized as to draw a dozen countries into the holocaust.

It follows that any new governmental policy, especially a military one, introduced in one country is bound to be felt throughout the world. We have abundant proof that this is true. When our fleet sailed around the world to show everybody we could "lick them to a frazzle," it became responsible for the inflated naval programs of several South American sister republics. Our huge military appropriations make similar appropriations in Japan almost inevitable, and Japan has no money to pay for them—only debt. When the German Emperor decades ago uttered his famous "Unsere Zukunft liegt auf dem Wasser" (our future lies on the waters), he brought about an almost revolutionary realignment of the European powers, and soon converted the traditional enmity between France and England into friendship. When France, two years ago, in "self-defense" against outside threats, extended her military conscription period from two to three years, she drew out an instant response from Germany in that that country levied a heavy income tax upon her rich people, so as to swell her "defensive" war chest. When Russia showed special signs of activity in the Baltic region, the Swedish people implored their king to increase the armaments of their country. And so on. The military program of one country is invariably bound up with that of the whole civilized world.

CONSCRIPTION IS UNDEMOCRATIC

By HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON. (From Congressional Record, Vol. 54; pp. 1290-1294.)

. . . In their new demands the militarists carefully avoid the use of the word "conscription"; they use the euphemisms "universal train-

ing" and "universal service." The scheme, however, cannot be disguised with agreeable words. Conscription is what they are demanding; conscription in its true and odious form; conscription as real and oppressive as now exists among the embattled nations of Europe; conscription which drags the boy from his mother's side, the father from the bosom of his family, and places them in the ranks as unwilling soldiers in time of peace; conscription with all its crushing weight upon the people, its denial of personal liberty, its espionage, its hateful methods of registration and interference with the freedom of men to come and go, to live their lives, and to seek happiness and well-being in their own way.

Conscription as a system is universally feared and hated. No nation has ever been willing to endure it except under the fear of destruction. Prussia, the first of all to adopt universal military service, introduced it in 1806, when Napoleon had garrisoned all her important cities and had limited her standing army to 42,000. France adopted it after the terrible defeat of 1870, under the menace of a powerful and victorious Germany. The British yielded to universal service only after entering the second year of the present war, after having raised 4,000,000 volunteer soldiers; and even as finally adopted it was not applicable to Ireland or the colonies. Australia voted conscription down two months ago, and our neighbor, Canada, though heroically responding to her duty in the great struggle, still declines to force her citizens into the ranks. How can it be, then, that the United States should accept any such system in a time of profound peace, when our friendship is courted by all the nations of the world?

Compulsory service in America is a new departure. In all our national life we have never had compulsory military service in time of peace. It cannot be claimed that any emergency now exists. We are at peace with the nations and threatened by none. They court, they crave, our friendship. Under such circumstances it is necessary that the advocates of conscription should produce some strong arguments in order to gain a patient hearing.

For the purpose of making their hateful scheme more acceptable to the masses the militarists have brought forth the claim that conscription is democratic; that it is a burden shared equally by all the people; that it promotes equality. . . .

Conscription Destroys Personal Liberty

Compulsory service, to be effective, requires the subjection of conscripts to many months of training, preceded and followed by systematic registration so as to know where each man is at any moment and what his movements are. From the birth of the unfortunate designed for conscription, the Government must lay its hands upon him, direct his movements and training, so that at the age for service he may be

brought forward in the best possible shape, spiritually and physically, to be placed in the ranks. This necessitates constant supervision over his life. It would regulate residence, occupation, schooling, mating, and every detail of his life up to the period of service, and even afterwards, so long as the conscript is subject to be called to the colors. Such a system is wholly incompatible with the freedom of action constituting personal liberty. It is intolerable to a lover of liberty and wholly inconsistent with the spirit of democracy and self-government.

Exemptions to Privileged Classes

The plea for conscription is based on the assumption that the dangers and hardships of service would fall equally upon all alike. This is a false assumption. Always the influential classes are able to escape the meshes of conscription laws by exemptions granted to educated classes and upper-class callings, and by other privileges obtained by corruption or favoritism.

It is one thing to pass conscription laws; another to enforce them. Always it is easier to enforce the laws against the poor and humble. If any may escape their meshes, it is the classes having wealth and influence. Let no hard-handed workingman expect to find the son of the capitalist serving alongside his son on terms of equality. A way will be found to avoid that. As a last resort, there are unmerited promotions and soft places to be found, perfunctory duties to be performed, easy clerkships, and such like. The toil and the drudgery, the digging and the sweating, that will be reserved for the sons of the masses.

Army Democracy!

By the very nature of military organization it is antagonistic to democracy. The gulf that yawns between the lowest commissioned officer and the enlisted man of whatever rank is so wide that even under the military laws of our own country, a democratic country, should the enlisted man upon provocation, no matter how great, so much as raise his naked hand against an officer he may be punished by the penalty of death.

With compulsory-service laws where it appears that all young men are to be forced into the Army, the pressure for appointments as officers will greatly increase, and the standards become more arbitrary, and closer and closer will be shut the door of admission of the sons of the masses into the exclusive circles of the Army and Navy. We will then have our military aristocracy of Army and Navy officers, powerful, jealous, and narrow-minded; hating democracy and warring upon it with every impulse; separating themselves still more from the masses, and thoroughly saturated with contempt for the man in the ranks. This is Army democracy!

Molded by democracy, man is reasonable, kind, and just; shaped by militancy, he is machine-like, emotionless, and severe. Nations trained in democracy take on aspects of amiability and the higher courage; trained in militancy, they are divided into the domineering, officious, and self-assertive officer class and the servile, docile, and enduring conscript class. Conscription makes war on democracy, it destroys democracy, for it splits society into a multitude of classes and castes in which each is sure of his position, and there can be no change. The young conscript at the critical time, when his mind and will are forming, is placed under the dominion of those whom he must accept as his superiors, irrespective of their worth, is bent to their will, is trained to recognize differences in rank and to accept them as all-important, and to obey the commands of authority as justified under all circumstances. He is trained to respect and support conditions as they are, and to accept and defend the established order. That conscription might make for stability and order there is little doubt. That it thwarts progress, stupefies the imagination, dulls initiative, and molds the citizens for civil life as dull, docile, and submissive must also be admitted. . . .

COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

By Ralph C. Smith, Colorado Agricultural College, in debate with Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College. (From Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. VI, pp. 358-368.)

We of the Negative are opposed to this plan as a system of national defense, because we believe it fails in the very purpose for which it is intended. It does not give us adequate military preparation for four reasons:

First, the plan does not provide sufficient training to make a good soldier.

Second, too small a proportion can even approach field efficiency at any time to give us a good army.

Third, it makes no provision for a well-trained reserve.

Fourth, it does not provide for a permanent force, which we shall show you is absolutely necessary to our national defense.

Taking up the first point, we maintain that such a system does not make an efficient soldier because it is impossible to train one in a year. You may be able to teach a recruit the manual of arms and which end of the gun to shoot from in one year, but modern warfare consists in far more than this. In our army today the recruit is trained for three years before he is considered proficient. The heads of our army have opposed any attempts to cut down the enlistment period, because they maintain that shorter time would not provide for sufficient training. Let me read you in part the list of studies prescribed by the War De-

partment in which our soldiers must be proficient: "Drill and maneuvers by the individual, squads, companies, regiments; marksmanship; entrenching; marching under full equipment; swimming under full equipment; sword and bayonet practice," and many others, including the care of the health and sanitation of the camp, etc. Besides this it takes two or three years to instill into the men that discipline which alone will hold them together under fire and make them obey their officers, and without which any army becomes a disorganized mob at the critical time. At the present time England has a volunteer army which she has been training for eight months at the rate of twelve and fourteen hours per day, and yet, even under the pressing demands of actual war, she hesitates to put these men in the field, because she does not consider them ready. Our worthy opponents have quoted Germany as an example of military efficiency. Surely this efficient military system would not keep its men in the army longer than is necessary to give a complete training, for this would only mean needless expense. What, then, is Germany's practice? At the present time they train their men for two years and have recently been trying to lengthen the time to three, because they have felt that two years was not long enough.

We have seen the military experts in the United States, England, and Germany agree that a long period of training is necessary, yet these gentlemen would have us adopt a system which trains men a few hours each day and calls them finished soldiers at the end of a year. Would this give us the national defense they tell us we need?

But even if a man were fully trained at the end of his year, only one-twelfth of those in the army could even approach field efficiency at any one time. I mean that each month they would only turn out one-twelfth of their men as having had in full the poor training that could be given by this system. The other eleven-twelfths would be raw recruits and partially trained men. How could any nation's army be efficient when less than 10 per cent of that army would be ready to take the field at any given time? Is this the force with which they intend to repel the well-trained armies which they tell us threaten our shores? Is this the force with which they propose to garrison our islands? One-twelfth of their army would be sixty or seventy thousand men, a number smaller than we have enlisted in our army today. Is this the way they propose to strengthen our national defenses?

In the third place, we maintain that their system fails to provide a proper reserve force. The question makes no provision for a reserve, and there is none in their plan. The compulsory period is only for one year. In case of war we would need more men than were actually in the army at the time war was declared. Where would we turn for these additional forces? We have no method of compelling those who have served their term to reënlist. We would have to depend upon their volunteering, so that we are back again to a volunteer system, exactly

where we started. All army units would have to be reorganized, for these men would have no definite place to report. It would amount to organizing a new army. It would require several months to retrain these men and develop under new officers the necessary order and discipline.

The gentlemen of the affirmative will probably have us believe that every American citizen who has been through their system will be ready to take the field as a finished soldier, thus supplying their reserves. But will he? He will have had no further training since his discharge from the army. He probably will not have fired a gun since he left. He may have been engaged in indoor occupations. He will have had no discipline since he was in the ranks. Could this man step into the army and endure the physical hardships necessary to war? Could he shoot like a man who had been kept in training? Would he still retain his habits of discipline, without which an army is useless? His training has been like a half-learned lesson that is soon forgotten. To make a good reservist a man would have to be kept up to some degree of military proficiency. The finished product of the affirmative system would have to be restrained for some months before he could take the field. Would an enemy courteously wait at our frontier for this training to take place?

WHY WE SHOULD NOT HAVE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE

By Ex-Governor Simeon E. Baldwin of Connecticut

In my judgment, any permanent system of universal military training and conscription would be unsuited both to the political and the social conditions existing in the United States.

We have made our President an officer of immense powers. They are great in peace; overwhelming in war. In framing our Constitution this policy was deliberately adopted. With states scattered over half a continent it was a vital necessity to have something like absolute authority in certain matters vested in a single executive magistrate. He must, in the nature of things, see that the laws of the United States are properly executed, whether by the people in general or any particular class of the people. The only recognized class is that engaged in the military and naval service. It is the President's right and duty to carry out the legislation of Congress in regard to it. Against the danger of his abusing this trust the only safeguard is impeachment. Against the danger of bad legislation by Congress there is the greater and self-executing safeguard of a constitutional provision that no appropriation of money for raising and supporting armies shall be for a longer term than two years.

The design of the framers of the Constitution was to have only a small standing army, but that it should be supported by a force of militia in each State, trained under a discipline prescribed by Congress. The necessities of the war of 1914-1918 have caused the virtual abolition of the state militia. Instead of it we have adopted, for the time being, the policy of conscription. The course of events has now brought us to the point where we must determine whether to perpetuate or to abandon it as a part of the American system of political government.

Our history since the Constitution was adopted shows that its framers were right in providing for a small army and a supplemental militia, only, in time of peace; leaving conscription to be resorted to only when necessary in time of war.

We shall never wage wars avowedly for conquest. For any others we can safely trust to voluntary enlistment in the armies and navies of the United States and the state militia, to be supplemented, in case of invasion or danger of invasion, by a temporary conscription act.

We have become the greatest and richest government on earth. Canning's statement, a century ago, that England had called upon the New World to redress the balance of the Old, if but half true then, has since been acted out in the wars just closed. We have had a main share, coöperating again with England, in shaping the events that have, in these wars, remade the face of Europe. Our success now becomes our danger. Power begets a constant temptation to use it. Power to dictate to other nations their course of conduct leads to a desire to exercise and enforce that power. Any conscription act tends to exalt the military and depress the civil authority. Safety for us does not lie that way.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Minister, Church of the Messiah, New York City.

From the strictly educational standpoint, military training is a betrayal of the prime object of education in a democratic community, which I assume to be self-development fulfilled in self-control. It takes a boy's distinctive individuality at its most impressionable period and degrades it to the repressive and deforming rigor of a wholly external system of iron discipline. Personal peculiarities, gifts, aspects of genius, are not only neglected, but deliberately removed. For boys, like men, fit into the military machine only to the extent that they are standardized.

From more general viewpoints, military training is similarly to be condemned. It awakens an interest in and devotion to that very system of disiipline which, more than any other one thing today, threatens civilization with ruin. It cultivates an ignoble type of patriotism which

interprets national loyalty in terms of distrust and hatred of alien peoples. It fosters an ethical standard of self-assertion and self-aggrandizement, rather than of self-sacrifice. It corrodes the religion of brotherhood and good will.

Nothing can justify military training for schoolboys, even from the militarist standpoint, but necessities of national defense. Such necessities for this country have yet to be proved, when, in the super-preparedness epoch of 1900-1914, no European nation found it necessary to resort to this device.

One need only to observe the human slaughter in the present war to realize that war is the greatest enemy to civilization known to men and that, if it is ever to cease, it must be through the education of the young in the truth that the higher virtues demand greater courage and more enduring qualities of character in the daily lives of men and women and in the self-control which results in a stable and prosperous nations than are ever demanded in times of war.

Boys, as well as girls, should be trained for life rather than for death. The highest courage is not shown in a disregard for death, but in loving some great principle more than life in the face of opposition and ignominy in times of peace, when no applauding multitude shouts its approval.

CHARLES F. DOLE

President Boston Twentieth Century Club

Military training is a continuous process, by subtle suggestion, to fill people's minds with the thought of enemy nations to be suspected and feared and perhaps fought and killed. This is the worst possible training for citizenship in a democracy. Our American democracy rests upon a basis of mutual respect and good-will; it implies a faith in the common humanity; it stops, therefore, at no boundary lines; wherever men are it presupposes human worth and seeks to establish relations of friendliness. The characteristic note of its training is that it looks for the best and not the worst in all kinds and conditions of men. The democracy falls apart in an atmosphere of ill-will or mistrust.

The war system, on the contrary, toward which military training inevitably tends, has always been the ally of aristocracy and tyranny, and is today the tool of every form of mercenary imperialism. It throws its glamor over the youth at their most susceptible age; it possesses them with a fictitious and artificial sense of the necessity of armies and battleships; it habituates them to distrust neighbor nations; it grows, indeed, out of fear and suspicion; looking for enemies, watchful against possible insults, proud of the instruments of power, it keeps the world restless and fearful. It fosters a vulgar national patriotism

which cries "America first," instead of a nationalism of brotherhood which places "Humanity over all." It therefore sets aside the noblest traditions of religion. How can we honestly teach our boys to obey the Golden Rule and proceed to train them to shoot men?

AMERICA'S ANSWER

The Danish newspaper, *Politiken*, in an editorial which has attracted considerable attention in Europe, says that America has sounded the death-knell of the "old-fashioned militarism" based upon eternal "preparedness":

"Last year jeering voices in Germany spoke of America's platonic declaration of war. A country without an army and navy would be unable to bring an army to Europe, even if it had one! Nobody believed in the possibility of raising an army of millions in a year. One had seen how long it took England to let her immense forces loose.

"Furthermore, it was argued, even if the human material were available, how, with short training, could it replace and outweigh the advantages possessed by the European powers, above all, Germany, with centuries of military traditions and years of preparation in arming?

"So one reasoned in Germany and outside. Now we live to see American transports cross the Atlantic apparently as safely as in peace times. Troops depart and arrive punctually—in August 300,000; in one year about 3,000,000.

"But there lies, in all this, a threat against the root of old-fashioned militarism. After this war even the most hardened militarists must ask themselves whether there is any sense in throwing millions away on a peace-time establishment, a gigantic army and navy, when the whole machinery can be improvised in a few months. That is precisely what America has done."

MR. ROOSEVELT'S GOSPEL OF REACTION

Editorial in *New York World*

Mr. Roosevelt said in the course of his speech at Springfield the other day:

> "When peace comes let us accept any reasonable proposal whether calling for a League of Nations or any other machinery which really offers some chance of lessening the number of future wars. But let us remember that any promise that such a league or other machinery will definitely do away with war is nonsense or sheer hypocrisy."

This is the familiar Tory-Junker argument in favor of returning to the military *status quo ante*, but does it represent anything more sub-

stantial than Tory-Junker opinion? Is manhood so perverse, is statesmanship so bankrupt, that no means can be provided for safeguarding the world against a repetition of the horrors in which it has been submerged for more than four years? When this present conflict is ended must the human race remain shackled to the military machine that has been incurred in crushing German autocracy and likewise works out the equally stupendous cost of a new program of preparedness?

It is estimated previous to this war that the nations of Europe alone were spending $2,000,000,000 a year on their military establishments, and these expenditures found their highest justification in the claim that preparedness for war prevented war. All the thousands of millions that were poured out so lavishly prevented nothing. In the end civilization was plunged into the bloodiest and most disastrous war of all human history.

If the old preparedness proved worthless as a means of defense, what will the new preparedness cost, and will it be less worthless? War has been revolutionized in the last four years. Even Germany, after forty years of methodical preparation, was not ready for the kind of war that had to be fought, and was compelled to reorganize all of her military machinery and all of her finances and industries to meet the new situation. A nation can be prepared for modern welfare only by putting it completely on a war basis and subordinating all of its activities to the single business of slaughter. It was recently estimated by one of the British labor members of Parliament that if another war must be reckoned with after this war, the cost of preparation will not be $2,000,000,000, a year but nearer $20,000,000,000 a year, and these figures are not extravagant. Unless there is a way out of this horrible trap in which we have all been caught, a condition of peace can be little preferable to a condition of war. The death losses may be less but the economic burdens will be so great that civilization will remain perpetually in chains, staggering under a burden so colossal that the future can carry no hope The German Government will have been defeated but the German idea will have triumphed everywhere.

If Mr. Roosevelt be right, the war is already a failure, and the wisest thing that the United States and the Allies could do would be to patch up a peace with Germany at once, save all the lives and the treasure that would be expended in obtaining a decision, and bend their energies to making ready for the next war. Why bleed to death to no purpose?

Mr. R. of course is wrong, monstrously wrong. If this war means anything it means that the Tory-Junker system is not only dead but damned. It can have no resurrection unless the self-governing peoples abandon the real cause in which they are fighting. There is no salvation in the old formula of preparedness. This is now preëminently a war to end war, and a league of nations is the only way out of the

Golgotha of militarism. It is not a proposal to be sneered at or dismissed as Utopian. It is today the one hope of a civilization weltering in blood and agony.

MEYER LONDON

Member of the House of Representatives, Twelfth District, New York. (From Symposium on Military Training issued by Peace Committee, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.)

To teach the child the art of war means to proclaim the supremacy of physical force, to abandon all belief in a nobler future for mankind; in short, to sanctify war.

I repudiate the notion which is now so assiduously being inculcated, that war is a part of human nature. Not even in the animal world do the animals of the same species seek to destroy one another. Are we to educate our young into being more beastly than the beasts?

COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

By RAYMOND MILLER, Colorado Agricultural College, in debate with Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College. (From Intercollegiate Debates, Vol. VI, pp. 368-374.)

We maintain that compulsory military service is un-American in principle and contrary to the very fundamental doctrines upon which this democracy was founded and has been maintained. The exact date of the origin of compulsory military service is not known, but it dates back to the time when the vassal served his lord during the feudalistic period, and the lord, in turn, was compelled to fight for his king. From some such origin has developed the great national systems of compulsory military service that we have among the nations of Europe today. It grows best in the most despotic nations. It was early abandoned by England. Our forefathers came to this country for the express purpose of freedom. Since that time we have never once thought of erecting above us a government that shall be as bad as the despotism from which we fled. . . .

We object to national defense by compulsory service because it is contrary to the principles of this nation arbitrarily to demand a year, and one of the most important years, from the lives of each of its citizens. Our nation has always depended upon voluntary service. As long as our Government is worthy of our respect it can continue to depend upon voluntary support. When it ceases to be worthy of our support, then even compulsory service cannot long maintain it.

We object to compulsory military service because we have no hereditary enemies. Where a nation has, where it depends upon the rising

generations to avenge the wrongs suffered by previous generations, where it must educate its youth to hate their neighbors, as is the case in Germany and France, such a system is a useful instrument. Today in Germany there is a great demand for the "God punish England" mottoes. But in America we do not teach our children to pray in hate and petition revenge for human injuries from a divine father. We are at peace with all nations, and cherish malice towards none. In the words of President Wilson, we do not covet anything that belongs to another nation. Under such conditions, is it necessary that we make a trained soldier out of every man who is capable of bearing arms? If the purpose is only to be able to defend ourselves, must we turn every peaceful village into an armed camp?

We say that compulsory military service is un-American because America has taken the lead in the movement for world peace. To initiate any such system at the present time would be to give up that position of influence of which we are so proud. It would place us by the side of Germany, Russia, and Japan, and the other militaristic nations. It would be hypocrisy for us to ask other nations to disarm and hail the dawn of universal peace, while we endeavor to make every man a soldier and claim it is only to be able to protect ourselves. No nation can object to our maintaining a force sufficient to insure our independence, but no nation will agree that the only way to do that is to train every man for war.

We maintain that compulsory military service is un-American because it breeds suspicion. At present all nations trust us. If we create here a great military system, other nations will suspect, and rightly so, that this huge weapon of defense may suddenly be converted into a weapon of offense. A huge increase in our army will create enough Latin-American suspicion to make it imperative that we further strengthen our means of defense. Every time we launch a new man-of-war, England and Germany will launch another to protect themselves, and we shall be compelled to build another to protect ourselves from theirs. And so it goes.

On our north is an invisible line four thousand miles in length that separates our territories from those of Canada. There is not a fort along it, and yet so well have we defended it that a century of peace has marked the relations of the two peoples that border on it. How better can we continue to guard that line and protect our shipping on the Great Lakes than we have in the past. If we construct forts and station armies along it to defend ourselves from Canadian aggression, Canada must do the same to protect herself from American aggression. The friendly, open-handed relations between the two nations would then end, to be followed by a suspicious truce where each nation would

jealously watch every movement of the other. If we are to continue to receive the good-will of all nations, we cannot adopt any such system of compulsory military service.

We maintain that compulsory military service is un-American because it would make those compelled to serve against their will hostile to the Government. They would be half-hearted, rebellious-inclined men. The criminal who is punished by the law for his misdeeds feels hostile to the law. How much more so must he feel who for no wrong act is compelled to give up a year to his government against his will. To be able to enforce such a law we should have to establish a system of passports, such as are employed in the nations of Europe. We should have to keep track of every individual and know where he was at all times. A man could not take a business trip without securing a passport from the police officers. Do you think the American people would submit to such a system? Yet unless we did employ some such system a man would be able to escape his year's military service by moving about the country.

It is un-American, lastly, because it tends to make the people militaristic. Our people are a peace-loving people, but a nation of warriors would want war. Can you teach a girl to dance, and expect her not to desire to dance? Can you teach a man to play baseball, and expect him not to desire to play baseball? Can you perfect a man in any art and then expect him not to desire to use the knowledge and power he has gained? Can you make a soldier out of every male citizen, and then expect our nation not to feel inclined to use its military strength when the occasion is offered? We say that compulsory military service is un-American because it would change us from a peaceful nation to one ambitious along military lines.

MILITARY TRAINING FOR BOYS—DO WE WANT IT?

By WILLIAM C. ALLEN. (From Debaters' Handbook on Military Training, pp. 158-159.)

Compulsory military training of lads fourteen years old and upward in New Zealand has been so exploited in some quarters that an investigation into the practical operation of such a system, or its dangers, is important at the present time.

Such training is claimed by some of its advocates to be different from conscription, but in practical operation it proves to be the same. The Defense Act of New Zealand of 1909 was made possible by the agitation of the National Defense League and by influences originating in England. The visit of the United States fleet to Australia resulted in a great wave of military enthusiasm spreading over that land, and one of the developments connected therewith was the demand to arm. The result of a combination of circumstances, seized by the militarists to

their own aggrandizement, "without any direct reference to the will of the people," and backed at first by some well-meaning educators, was that the men of those countries put their defenseless boys under military discipline to which the voters would not themselves pretend to submit in times of peace.

Figures supplied by Arthur Watts, organizer of the Australian Freedom League, revealed extraordinary conditions. Even registrations were difficult to get. He shows that in Australia in 1913, despite the fact that the military officers had power to register boys without their parents' consent, the number liable to prosecution for nonregistration at the end of the registration period was 7,324.

Official figures quoted in the *Melbourne Age* of 31st of May, 1912, disclosed that to that date the total average attendance for Australia at the statutory parade drills was 59,562 out of the total strength of 88,859 senior cadets (eighteen years old and under) stated by the military authorities to be in actual training. The percentage of absentees from drills ranged from about thirty-one to fifty-two per cent. The *Age* adds: "It is plain that large numbers of cadets are shirking their legal obligations."

There have been very many prosecutions of boys under the system which in each country is known as the Defense Act. Nonattendance at drill from almost whatever cause necessarily constitutes a basis for prosecution. In Auckland, New Zealand, of about 90,000 population, during the twelve months ending at an early date in 1914, there were, not counting withdrawn cases, a record of 770 prosecutions. There are reported, for instance, as many as fifty defense prosecutions in the police court of the little city of Invercargill, N. Z., at one time.

The administration of prosecutions has been very severe in many cases. The act in both countries provided alternative service and assumed relief for members of denominations opposed to military service, but no relief for the many others who resisted drill because of religious or other conscientious principles.

Australia seems to have become anything but a free country since it established juvenile military drill. The actual conditions are not, so far as I can learn, unfolded in government reports or mentioned in circulars for intending immigrants. . . .

An oath is demanded of the boys. That in New Zealand has been as follows:

"I, ..., do sincerely promise and swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to our Sovereign Lord, the King, his heirs and successors, and that I will faithfully serve in the New Zealand military forces, according to my liability under the Defense Act at present in force, and that I will observe and obey all orders of his Majesty, his heirs and successors, and of the generals and officers set over me until I shall be lawfully discharged. So help me, God."

This oath, we are told, was often forced by threats of fine and imprisonment on boys who were drilling and on those whose parents refused to consent to their boys binding themselves to so drastic a surrender of their consciences into the keeping of the military authorities. We may easily conceive of the attitude created in the minds of thousands of lads toward governmental authority when many are thus compelled to take oaths and others are placed in a position of disobedience to parental control.

Before New Zealand came under the iron heel of militarism the only person who could inflict a fine upon any one was a magistrate. But today a military officer can impose fines on the boys under his care at his own sweet will, and, what is far more serious, can cause that fine to be collected by a policeman out of the lad's wages (if he works for wages). . . .

The writer feels a deep sympathy for the vast number of conscientious teachers and parents who desire to help our boys. Yet military instruction for them does not in practical operation seem to be a valuable moral factor, but the reverse. It does not improve the national health, or foster the sort of discipline that is wanted. The most satisfactory discipline for boys is that which is today being obtained in many excellent schools without the temptations and moral damage of military associations The training of children in military ideals, however well intended, is a retrograding step. It tends to lure them from gainful pursuits toward illusive militarism. The burden evenually falls heaviest on the poor. It strikes at civil and religious freedom and in practice leads to compulsory tyranny. A well-known clergyman of New Zealand has said of it, "It represents paganism in excelsis." To maintain this system a disturbing propaganda of jingoism and international fear has to be promoted in the community. Even Germany has not taught her boys to kill. Shall we out-Prussia Prussia? Shall we have conscription for our boys in times of peace as is now being urged for America?

If you give the military or naval advocates an inch they take an ell. You never know how far they will lead you. Militarism is the same the world over—first ingratiating, next seductive, then remorseless. Do we want even the thin edge of militarism introduced into our public schools?

EDWARD DAVIDSON

Ohio State University in Debate against Cornell University. (University Debaters' Annual 1916-17, p. 87.)

Our opponents ask us if we did not resort to universal service in the Civil War. I ask them if we did resort to universal service in the War of the Revolution, in the War of 1812, in the Mexican War, or in the

Spanish-American War. Their only possible answer must be, No. Has not every war from without led to an abundance of volunteers? Did not drafting lead to rioting during the Civil War? Gentlemen, the American people are only too willing to give their lives to their country when her honor and safety are at stake. The very idea of adopting universal military service is an insult to American manhood.

We have come to believe that it is not necessary for every man to know how to make his own clothes, that it would be an expensive policy to teach every man how to bind books just because he reads them. I ask you whether it would not be just as foolish to require every man to know how to be a soldier when perhaps his generation will never see a battle. Our plan provides for regular soldiers, and a corps of officers who could soon train an army if need be.

SHOULD OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM INCLUDE ACTIVITIES WHOSE SPECIAL PURPOSE IS PREPARATION FOR WAR?

By Dr. Nathan C. Schaeffer, Superintendent of Public Instruction for Pennsylvania.

. . . It is a widespread notion that military drill benefits a boy's physique and that it is an essential part of physical education. If this be so, why are the girls excluded from military drill? The war brides need as much bodily health and vigor as the soldiers who marry them if future generations are not to show signs of decadence. Military drill for girls would be the logical conclusion if military drill were essential to the development of a healthy body and a sound mind. Investigations have shown the contrary to be true, and in these days nothing in educational practice is considered conclusive unless based upon scientific experiments. "Experiments which were conducted," says Dr. Darby of London, "in a public school with a view to ascertain the relative value of gymnastics and mere drill, showed that the average results yielded by the former were more than three times as great as those yielded by drill alone." Relatively, therefore, this method of physical culture is inferior. Military drill is defective inasmuch as it does not to any extent meet the physical demands of the body. Its effect upon boys is not salutary. It does not, as the community at large have believed, make a youth erect or give him a graceful, manly bearing. On the contrary, it tends to make him stiff and angular in his movements, as well as to droop and round his shoulders." This conclusion is in entire harmony with the investigations of Dr. Sargent, of the Hemenway Gymnasium at Harvard University, who claims that the gracefulness which is thought to characterize the movements of your cadets is not the outcome of drilling and marching, but rather of the hours spent each day under the direction of the dancing master.

"After taking the most favorable view possible of military drill as a physical exercise," says this eminent authority, "we are led to conclude that its constrained positions and closely localized movements do not afford the essential requisites for developing the muscles and improving the respiration and circulation, and thereby improving the general health and condition of the system. We must further conclude that in case of any malformation, local weakness, or constitutional debility the drill tends by its strain upon the nerves and prolonged tension on the muscles to increase the defects rather than to relieve them."

"If the ultimate objects of the drill were to prepare young men for the life and duties of the soldier we should," says Dr. Sargent, "be forced to conclude that the drill itself would still be defective as a means of developing the chief requisites for men in that profession." . . .

Military drill seeks to develop unquestioning obedience, so that the soldier will move forward in the face of danger and even certain death, but it does not develop obedience to conscience, to a sense of right, and to the divine imperative of duty. The lessons of the Sunday-school are thrown to the winds upon the field of battle.

The explicit declaration of a British commander-in-chief that maxims like "Truth always wins in the long run," "Honesty is the best policy," did very well for copy-books, but are not to be acted upon in warfare, shows how war and preparation for war upsets our ethical standards. Legitimate warfare includes and justifies "all the mean, false, cowardly and unchivalrous actions which youth have been taught to despise in their own behalf, such as stratagems, ambushes, spying, eavesdropping, hitting from behind or when a fellow is down, lying, forging letters, telegrams, signals to mislead the enemy, following up a beaten enemy and hammering at him with cavalry and artillery to annihilate him; insisting upon the severest possible terms of surrender, or refusing all offers of surrender with the order, Take no prisoners." It is bad enough when these practices and principles enter into adult life. To instill them into the subconscious life of adolescent youth results in moral damage from which the pupil never recovers. Having been taught by militarism that it is permissible to suspend the decalogue for his country's sake, he is in danger afterwards of repealing the Ten Commandments for his own sake whenever any advantage can thereby be gained in the political or financial world. . . .

The militarism of the so-called great powers of Europe has come to judgment. Have you ever watched German women hitched up with dogs drawing carts through the streets while their sons were drilling? Have you noticed how little the Italian peasant has to eat and wear, although working the most fertile soil under the sunniest of skies, the products of his industry being consumed by the army? Have you looked into the hovels of Russian peasants, and seen their tables and

their backs almost stripped bare of food and clothing in order that the army might be fed and clothed and supplied with guns and powder and missiles of destruction? Have you seen the Russian farmer, when the tax-gatherer had taken his last heifer, hitch his wife and children to the plow so that there might be another harvest? Have you seen that peasant selling the grain which he and his children would need during the winter in order to escape a flogging by government officials, whilst the mother with tears in her eyes was trying to keep alive the suckling at her breast, gone dry, by the offer of a little bread moistened with saliva? Have you stood at Ellis Island and watched the incoming tide of Europe's poor, with the light gone out of their eyes, many of them trampled out of shape under the heels of the war lords of their native land? Could you doubt that some day Europe would stand at God's judgment bar and pay the penalty for its militarism?

COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

By Lucia Ames Mead. (From Debaters' Handbook on National Defense, pp. 182-184.)

. . . To win consent to universal service it is asserted that it is good on general principles. It would "teach hygiene and acquaintance with instruments of precision." So do proper boys' camps and training with carpenters' tools. "Such waste as has occurred at the beginning of past wars would be prevented." We ourselves began our three foreign wars, all of which were unnecessary; and, as in the nature of the case, the South as much as the North would have been helped by better preparation before our Civil War, this argument fails. It is above all things claimed that compulsory service "promotes democracy." The officer must have long training of a special, high-class grade. Class distinction is nowhere more marked than in the army, as in all lands is fixed between officer and private. The Swiss Socialists complain that this is true even in Switzerland. Military efficiency requires that one man may be absolute master of another, and enforce as strict obedience as if he were a prisoner or a slave. The Dreyfus and Zabern incidents and the treatment of colored cadets in our military schools are significant. Rich and poor may bunk in the same tent, but the rich man's family suffers no such loss as his poor comrade's does. One is provided for and the latter may starve.

The recent assumption that the demand for compulsory service involves the same principle as the demand for payment of taxes is grossly sophistical. When a taxpayer, for conscientious or other reasons, refuses to pay taxes, he suffers no personal restraint. He merely submits, as some of the best people in England did a dozen years ago, to having a small portion of their goods taken and sold for the required amount. But the conscript must submit his person to strict, outside control, and

if war comes, he is forced to fight, even if it be in a war which he considers as unjust as General Grant declared our Mexican war to be. This, he asserted, was "one of the most unjust wars ever fought by a strong people against a weak people." Our Government needs the taxes of all. It does not need the military service of all. The effort to put the two upon a parity in the public mind as regards the principle of compulsion illustrates the crudity of thought with which this whole subject has been treated.

"Universal service promotes unity." No, it only promotes outer uniformity. Austria's militarism has never unified her seventeen different nationalities. Our Slavs, Greeks, Armenians, and Italians in folk dances on Chicago playgrounds, in social centers, and in public schools, gain a wholesome unity that comes from common interests. In a few years we obliterate the age-long, inherited hatred of aliens towards each other. Give three years more public schooling to the average child and one compulsory year in a public school to the private school child, teach history and civics as they should be taught, and we shall in childhood years create far more permanent unity than by forcing men from business to practice target-shooting together.

The vaunted value of military discipline is seen only in war. The soldier returned to civic life is no more chaste, temperate, or self-controlled than other men. Republican government implies initiative, self-control, and independent thought—precisely what military compulsion vitiates.

UNIVERSAL SERVICE AS EDUCATION

By JOHN DEWEY. (From The New Republic, Vol. VI, p. 309.)

. . . But it is not necessary to bring accusations against the policy of military service. The real point is that we find it so much easier to cry up this policy than to remedy those defects in our existing system which produce the evils in question. Any truly educative system must precede and prevent instead of following after and palliating and undoing. Until we have at least made a beginning in nationalizing our system of education, it is premature to appeal to the army, to marching and to sleeping in barrack cots as the best way to remedy the evils of a lack of national-mindedness. When Mr. Lippman suggested nationalizing our means of transportation and communication as a method of securing an integrated and coherent America, some of his critics intimated that his project was too materialistic. Well, the district schoolhouse of some portions of the United States—often those very portions which most deplore the foreign invasion—with its independent district control is a symptom of a spiritual localism which defies a unified America quite as much as does any racial area and dialect press. We might at least try the experiment of making our

Federal Bureau of Education at Washington something more than a bookkeeping and essay-writing department before we conclude that military service is the only way of effecting a common mind. When Mr. Roosevelt writes with as much vehemence about national aid to vocational education, national aid to wipe out illiteracy, and national aid for evening and continuation schools for our immigrants, as he now writes in behalf of military service, I for one shall take him more seriously as an authority on the educational advantages of setting-up exercises, firing guns, and living in the camp.

I can see a vision of a national government which takes an interest at once paternal and scientific in our alien visitors, which has a definite policy about their reception, and about their distribution, which guards them even more jealously than its own sons against industrial exploitation, and which offers them at every turn educational facilities under its own charge. If every foreign illiterate had compulsory educational service to perform, if he had not only the opportunity but the obligation to learn the English language, if he found conditions of labor safeguarded in the interest of his health and his integrity as an economic agent, and if he learned to associate these things in whatever part of the country he found himself with the United States and not with the district, township, or State, it would not be long before the compulsory service, if it had to be discussed at all, would be discussed as a military proposition and not as an educational one. Until we have developed an independent and integral educational policy, the tendency to assume that military service will be an efficient tool of public education indicates a deplorable self-deception. I sometimes think the worst of the evils connected with militarism, in fact and in idea, is its power to create such illusions. Military service is the remedy of despair—despair of the power of intelligence.

The argument for universal military service for educational purposes is much stronger when put upon general grounds than when the needs of the immigrant are conspicuous in the plea. Rear Admiral Goodrich has said: "The average American boy is neither obedient, helpful, nor well-mannered. We have learned that these things cannot be taught in the homes. Something is needed, and that is universal training." The indictment of the native-born and of his home life is so sweeping as to undo itself; let it pass. Statements from a broader social point of view set forth the need of training which will develop a more extensive and vital sense of responsibility than is now found. Speaking roughly, our youth of the more favored class have much done for them, and little is expected in return; there is little to foster public-mindedness. Politically they are spoiled children. The less favored youth are so preoccupied with the practical demands of the moment and the relaxations of sparse moments of relief that the State is for them also a remote and pallid entity. Our easy-going disposition, our comfort,

our size, our congested towns, the invitations of the passing hour, combine with our individualistic tradition to depress from view the claims of organized society. We are overstimulated in matters of personal success and enjoyment; we have little that teaches subordination to the public good or that secures effective capacity to work coöperatively in its behalf. No two persons would draw up the statement in quite the same terms, but a family likeness would show through any number of different statements.

Enforced military training is urged as a remedy, not with military preparedness as its main end, but as an agency of a socializing education. As in the case of the Americanization of the immigrant, I feel that the arguments for compulsory service are more effective in depicting an evil than in setting forth a remedy. There is a temptation to digress, and ask whether the emotions aroused by the war are not the real cause of idealization of the moral possibilities of military training. For a dominant emotional mood always idealizes irrespective of facts. A heroic mood is a fine mood in which to face the urgencies of imminent action, but the indicative mood is a safer mood in which to think clearly. I have an impression that many persons, stirred to an intensified loyalty, imagine that the spirit which is their voluntary attitude will somehow accrue in others as a result of compulsory training. Surely this is belief in social magic.

J. EDGAR PARK

Minister Second Church, Newton, Mass. (From Symposium on Military Training, published by Peace Committee, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.)

I oppose the military training of boys because the regular outdoor sports and indoor gymnasium exercise tend to make a stronger, more independent man out of the boy. Older people, especially those to whom a boy is nothing but a noisy, dirty, unruly animal, think it is very cute to see boys all clean and straight, walking with mechanical accuracy, obeying with absolute unanimity, standing still, saluting superiors, and such things. The joy is all in the adult mind. God did not make boys to be tin soldiers. You destroy something divine in the boy when you allow the world to begin too soon to drill him into an exact reproduction of the man next him. If you want to do it, at least wait till he has had his boyhood. If the worst comes to the worst, the best soldier will be the boy who has not felt the military roller over his body and soul till after his body and soul have had their natural chance of growth.

Our good friends who advocate the military training of boys are right in their ideal, but a little hasty in their method. National service is more than merely training for slaughter. Let boys learn first to be a part of the national life by helpful service.

ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

President Amherst College. (From Symposium on Military Training, published by Peace Committee, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.)

I wonder if available evidence shows that military training does, in our American life, give better results in terms of obedience, discipline, precision, the sense of order and of obligation, than does nonmilitary training. Are the graduates of our military schools better boys than those who come from other schools? As against that suggestion I would put in evidence the statement that apparently the overwhelming majority of our schoolmasters have been opposed to military teaching.

Are our soldiers and sailors better men, better citizens, in the ordinary relationships of life, than are other men? I would not deny it, but I should hesitate to found a universal scheme of training upon it.

The plain truth is that there is not one of the virtues under discussion which cannot by proper teaching be as well developed in connection with the teaching of other subjects as under the guise of military training. If those subjects are not giving the virtues as well as we have a right to expect, then they are not properly taught.

RALPH LAUGHLIN

Ohio State University in Debate against Cornell University. (From University Debaters' Annual 1916-17, pp. 83-84.)

I will now show that universal military service is unjust to the individual, to the nation, and to the world. First, let us take it up from the standpoint of the individual. As we have already shown universal military service is not necessary for the adequate protection of our own rights and property. Even the Affirmative will agree with us in the statement that it is a principle of our Government that we shall not intrude upon the rights and property of other nations. Therefore, since universal military service is not necessary to protect our shores from the intrusions of others, and since it is opposed to our principles that we should not intrude on the rights of others, then universal military service is unnecessary, and to force every able-bodied man in the United States to train for such an army is an unnecessary burden which will lead to an injustice. The Negative admits that the country has a right to call upon every citizen in time of need, but we would point out to you that even in 1863, when this country was facing a great crisis and when grave dangers surrounded us, Lincoln was slow to call for conscription. We would call your attention to the fact that it has only been in the last few months that England has adopted a like measure, despite the grave situation which she is facing. And yet our opponents would call for permanent conscription, not as preparation for some emergency but as a permanent principle of government. We

point out to you that such an innovation is an unnecessary burden and will be unjust to the individual.

Second, universal military service is unjust from the standpoint of the nation. No matter how inherent in a nation lie the principles of democracy, liberty, and peace, if you force upon that nation an institution founded on monarchy and war, the people will give up the ideal of their old principle for the ideal of their new practice. Give a small boy books to read and he will become a lover of books, with his ideals and ambitions in books. Put the small boy in the out-of-doors and his ideals, his ambitions, and happiness will be that of nature. So, place the young men of America practicing for war generation after generation, and their ideals, their ambitions, and their happiness will be in war. Bismarck has said, in speaking of universal military service, "The very endangerment of the peace lies in the very foundation of the institution." Europe today is living out the results of universal military service. Speak of universal military service and you think of but one nation. Speak of the cause of this great war, and the same thought flashes vividly across your mind. These are the facts that convince us that to train the young of America for war, generation after generation, is but to bring war upon us. This we point out would be unjust to the nation.

Lastly, universal military service is unjust to the world. Today we are facing a great crisis. Lloyd George has said, "England will fight until militarism is crushed." The Allies are giving life, liberty, and property to crush that cursed institution which even Bismarck admits is the outgrowth of universal military service. The United States is in the balance. Shall we who have hitherto been the leader of peace now turn and become the leader of war? If we accept the proposition which the Affirmative proposes here this evening, we will develop in this nation an army far greater than Germany has ever conceived, and thus we will develop a militaristic spirit of greater magnitude. Shall we who have been the outstanding exponent of peace and humanity turn and become the outstanding exponent of militarism and war? Shall the curse of the next generation be the militarism of America instead of that of Europe? We point out to you that to bring about such a condition would be unjust to the world itself.

LONDON TIMES, JANUARY 19, 1918, ACCOUNT OF CONFERENCE WITH TRADE UNION DELEGATES

A Delegate—How about universal military training after the war?

Mr. Lloyd George—It is my hope, and that is really what we are fighting for, that we shall establish conditions that will make compulsory service unnecessary, not merely in this country, but in every country. Unless we succeed in establishing those conditions, I personally shall not feel that we have achieved one of the most important of our war aims.